

ISMAIL HAKKI BURSEVI'S

translation of and commentary on

FUSUS AL-HIKAM

by

MUHYIDDIN IBN 'ARABI



VOLUME 4

rendered into English by

BULENT RAUF

with the help of

R. BRASS and H. TOLLEMACHE

CONTENTS

The Wisdom of Compassion in the Word of Solomon	761
The Wisdom of Being in the Word of David	801
Of the Wisdom of the Self (or Breath) in the Word of Jonah (Yunus)	827
Of the Wisdom of the Unknowable in the Word of Job	841
The Wisdom of Awesome Majesty in the Word of John (Yahya)	857
Of the Wisdom of Ownership in the Word of Zachariah	867
Of the Wisdom of Intimacy in the Word of Elijah	879
Of the Wisdom of Beneficence in the Word of Loqman	903
Of the Wisdom of Religious Leadership in the Word of Aaron	921
The Wisdom of Eminence in the Word of Moses	945
Of the Wisdom of Intention and Refuge in the Word of Khalid	1047
The Wisdom of Singularity in the Word of Mohammed	1051

The Wisdom of Compassion (*al-ḥikmat ar-raḥmâniyyah*) in the Word of Solomon

LET it be known like this, that *rahmah*, Merciful Beatitude, is according to two divisions. One is the Merciful Beatitude of the Ipseity, and the other is the Merciful Beatitude of qualification. Each of these two is also divided into two. One is the general Merciful Beatitude, and the other is the private Merciful Beatitude. Thus Merciful Beatitude has four origins which become like mothers to other variations, as from these four chapters of the Merciful Beatitude ninety-six variations occur. When the ninety-six are added to the four origins, a hundred occurs. And when the Envoy said: '*Allâh* has a hundred compassions', he notified of these hundred. God in the Quran also told of the four origins of the Merciful Beatitude by: '*Bismi-llâhi-r raḥmâni-r raḥîm*', '*al-ḥamdu lillâh ar-rabb al-â'zimîn*.' The two Mercies which are in the '*Bismi-llâhi-r raḥmâni-r raḥîm*' are the general essential Compassionate Beatitude and the private essential Compassionate Beatitude. And the two Mercies which are in the *Fâtiḥa* (first chapter of the Quran) are the general qualificative Compassionate Beatitude and the private qualificative Compassionate Beatitude, and the rest of the variants of the *raḥmân* diversify from these.

The Compassionate Beatitude which was made private to Solomon was the Compassionate Beatitude which is qualificative and general, and this Mercy is the predication of the general essential Compassionate Beatitude which encompasses all things. That is why there is general qualification for this Compassionate Beatitude. It is because of this that Solomon's rule and *taṣarruf* became generalized in the universe. God subjugated to him the high and the low universes. The proof of the low universes being subjugated to him is his dominance over the jinn and Man and wild animals and birds, and other sea or land animals. His dominance even passed beyond the animals and prevailed over the elements; thus he subjugated the wind, and the wind blew according to his order. And he subjugated water to himself, so that the fiery satans could dive into it for him. And this is the summum

of subjugation, to cause things made of fire to unite with things of water, and to make things made of water unite with fire, thus bringing together two opposing natures. God mentioned this specifically to show how everything worked for Solomon, pointing out that the satans dived into deep water, the difficulty of bringing together opposing natures, and thereby showing how He subjugated the whole of the globe to Solomon. But this subjugation of the higher universes to him by God is proved only at the level of those who have vision, because whatever was possible for Solomon to bring about through *ḥukm* and *taṣarruf* is from the effects of the fact that God subjugated the high universes to him. And the causes of these *taṣarrufs* is through God's making him know what to do. It is thus that the subjugation made for Solomon, as mentioned above, is from the effects of the general predication which is particular to the general Compassionate Beatitude. On the other hand, the Compassionate Beatitude which is private and essential, that is gracious kindness from God, which is called with the name of Ancient Faithfulness, which is of the effects of the love of God for some of His servants and is not due to a cause and due to a response to a demand, which is other than this, or due to knowledge and action. God mentions this also concerning Khidr by saying: 'We gave him *raḥmah* from Us and made him know the knowledge of Our *ladun*.'

The Compassionate Beatitude which is private and qualificative is particular to the happy ones, and its predication is divided into two. One division is temporary, and the other is non-temporary. The temporary one is particular to the happy ones in this world, which allows them to be victorious over their aims, according to their resolve during the dominance of states and times. God united the two happinesses for Solomon. Thus the happiness and the Compassionate Beatitude of Solomon is not temporary, but rather it is of eternal predication.

The non-temporary private Compassionate Beatitude is for the people of paradise, because the grace upon them is eternal.

It is because it was made particular to Solomon, the Compassionate Beatitude which is qualificative and general, and the Compassionate Beatitude which in its turn is both temporary and non-temporary, that the Wisdom of the Compassionate Beatitude became private to the Word of Solomon. However, as the qualificative and general Compassionate Beatitude which was bestowed upon Solomon, in most parts became apparent through the bringing of the throne of Bilqîs from

Saba, and the bestowal of the person of Bilqîs to him, the Shaykh started the Wisdom of Solomon by describing the state of Bilqîs.

Now let it be known like this, that some have said that Bilqîs is the daughter of Sharakhîl from the descendants of Ya'arab bin Qaḥṭân, and Sharakhîl was a very great king (ruler). He married a woman of the jinn who used to be called Rayḥâna bint As-Sukun. Thus Sharakhîl had a daughter from Rayḥâna which was Bilqîs, and Sharakhîl had no other children except Bilqîs. Others said that the father of Bilqîs was the vizier of the King of Saba, Sharâkhî bin Sharakhîl, whose name was Du Sarakh ibn Hud-hâd bin Muṭṭâ bin Mâlik bin Saba, and her mother was 'Amîrah Bânû who was the daughter of 'Amîr bin Haym, the King of the jinn, whom Du Sarakh had married and brought to the town of Saba. 'Amîrah Bânû became pregnant by Du Sarakh, and Bilqîs was born. After a while, having had Sharâkhî bin Sharakhîl's, the King of Saba's, head cut off, he became king in his place. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, in his *Tarjumân al-Ashwâq*, says that Bilqîs was born between Man and jinn, and that her mother was of mankind and her father was of the jinn. If her father had been of mankind and mother from the jinn, she would have been dominated by the spirituality. Before Bilqîs married in reality Solomon, she was particularized for Solomon from all eternity, and was established in friendship over Solomon before the love-affair between them was reckoned, but as years of separation and differences continued, Bilqîs of her own opinion became doubtful and prostrated to other than God. When Solomon knew that her time of felicity came close, he attacked her with eternal relationships of love and aspirations of compassion, and sent her a letter speaking of God, wherein he mentioned secretly the friendship of marriage and old established agreements, and he started the letter with the *Basmalah* (*Basmalah* meaning *Bismi-llâhi-r rahmâni-r rahîm*) and gave *ḥamd* to his Lord to whom all *ḥamd* returns, and mentioned to Bilqîs the two Compassionate Beatitudes, and essential Compassion and the brought-about Compassion, and established the two Compassions between the couple, and protected her with both the Compassionate Beatitudes, because the lover by the necessities of being the lover is *rahmahtized*, and then he sealed his letter with his own seal and burdened it to the Hoopoe who is strengthened and corroborated with the Divine Breath and aspirations of compassion, and sent the letter with him. The letter arrived at Bilqîs unknown by those who were of her government, so that Bilqîs said to

her ministers and government: 'Indeed, a gracious and generous letter has been thrown to me.'

It is, that is to say the letter, from Solomon, and that which it contains is in the Name of God, the most Merciful and Compassionate. When the letter from Solomon was thrown to Bilqîs, Bilqîs showed the letter to her people and said: 'It is from Solomon', that is to say, this letter is definitely from Solomon, and most definitely what it contains is in the Name of the *rahmân* and *rahîm*. The Shaykh says here what God says: 'It is from Solomon, and it is . . .' These words are the words of Bilqîs and it does not relate to what is contained in the letter. What is contained in the letter is: 'In the Name of the most Merciful and Compassionate. Do not elevate yourselves above us, but come to us as muslims', and the words of Bilqîs to her people that a gracious letter was thrown to her proves what is apparent here. Therefore, the words: 'It is from Solomon, and it is . . .' are the words of Bilqîs. That is to say, the letter is from Solomon, and when she begins to say what is in the letter she says again for the second time 'it is'. Thus the beginning of the letter is in the Name of God, not in the name of Solomon.

(The Quranic reference to this episode concerning Solomon and Bilqîs says: 'It is from Solomon, and it is in the Name of the most Compassionate and the most Merciful.' Some people who have read this Quranic verse have taken it as the name of Solomon preceding the Name of God, which according to good form is inadmissible, tactless, therefore some again have attributed this to the self-aggrandizement of Solomon, tactlessly putting his name before the Name of God. What the Shaykh wishes to show here is that Bilqîs did not make a mistake reading Solomon's name first, as the words: 'It is from Solomon' refer not to the text of the letter but to what Bilqîs said to her people. When she says 'and it is' for a second time and reads out what is written actually in the letter, she read: 'In the Name of God, the most Compassionate and Merciful.')

The Shaykh goes on to say some people took it as though the name of Solomon preceded the Name of God, which means that some of the interpreters of the Quran took it as though 'It is from Solomon' was part of the letter of Solomon, thus Solomon preceding his own name to that of God, and they were astonished that Bilqîs did not burn the top of the letter for fear of lack of respect to the Name of God, because in those days it was the custom of the Jabarî (proud, tyrannical,

rebellious man who works iniquity) to tear off the beginnings of the letters out of treachery for the sender, but Solomon did not put his name before that of God, and in any case, this would not be in accordance with the perfection of knowledge of Solomon, so that to avoid Bilqîs from burning the top of the letter he would put his own name before that of God, because knowledge of God necessitates tact and aggrandizement, and this aggrandizement necessitates the precedence of the Name of God and not the appearance of Solomon in self-aggrandizement. Thus the Shaykh refutes the words of such interpreters, and says how could Solomon put his name before that of God, and how could this be suitable with the knowledge that Solomon had of his Lord? Bilqîs says of the letter that it was a gracious letter, which means that it was a letter to which gracious reception was necessary and action in accordance with what it said. Therefore, Bilqîs qualified the letter with graciousness, and Bilqîs was made certain by God of this and was in accordance. When the Hoopoe threw the letter of Solomon to Bilqîs, she accepted what it said in her heart, and showed it to her people so that only through discussion they should also come to accept it, and by what she qualified it with she meant to say: 'This letter is necessarily worthy of grace.' Thus it is not suitable that people have even considered to speak about Solomon's name preceding that of God.

There are some who attack those who think that Solomon put his name before that of God, and say how would it be possible for Solomon, although they are muslims, to put the name of Solomon before that of God, thus maintaining that the name of Solomon is put before the Name of God. Thus, in that way, although they seem to praise Solomon, they still blame him. However, the truth is that Bilqîs qualified Solomon's letter with grace and received it graciously, even though she was still an unbeliever. Although as yet she had not said in the presence of Solomon: 'Lord, I oppressed myself, now I fide myself, with Solomon, to God the Lord of the universes', yet before saying this, with the grace she had qualified the letter with, she had already accepted the contents of the letter and was obedient to the order of Solomon. Thus, the most suitable to Solomon's knowledge is what the Shaykh has mentioned concerning this matter, that: 'It is from Solomon, and it is . . .' are the words of Bilqîs, and it is to tell from whom the letter had come, as she had not mentioned the sender of the letter when she referred to it by saying: 'A letter was thrown to

me which was gracious.' She had done it this way because of her respect, so that her people would not be in opposition if she mentioned Solomon first, because that was rather expected of her people and they would be in constrictioin. If they had heard the letter of Solomon they would at once know that Solomon was inviting them to his Lord, and if they obeyed him that the country would become Solomon's and the rule would go out of their hands, and that equally if they did not obey Solomon and opposed him and if Solomon entered their country and conquered it, again their rule would be untenable. Thus Bilqîs did not mention the sender of the letter because of the grandeur of the name, and because of her respect for the sender of the letter, and only qualified it with generousness, so that her people would be expansive. and only afterwards she specified the letter as being: 'It is from Solomon.' And the following: '. . . and it is in the Name of God', describes how the letter started, as with '*Bismi-llâhi-r rahmâni-r rahîm*' and all that follows. And some of the people who believed that Solomon had put his name before that of God likened it to Caesar's (the Byzantine Emperor) tearing the letter of the Prophet, but this assignment of reason is not valid because Caesar did not tear the Envoy's letter because the Envoy preceded his own (Caesar's) name with the Name of God and his own name, but tore it rather perhaps because the invitation was against his religion, and that the letter was against Caesar, and for this the Shaykh says: And he did not tear it until he had read it all and knew what it contained. If he had torn it at once, having seen that the Name of God and the name of the Envoy were before his own name, it might have been possible to think that he tore it because of this precedence, but Caesar read the whole of this letter from the beginning to the end, and destroyed it only because the invitation which was contained in the letter was against his own religion. Thus, to think that he would destroy the letter if it started with the Name of God rather than Solomon does not hold, and with all this, between the time of Solomon and the story of Bilqîs and the time of the Envoy and Caesar, there are long eras that have passed. If Bilqîs were not at God's side (or opinion) and had not been from eternity led to success, belief and surrender, like Caesar she would have also destroyed the letter after having learnt its contents, but through her respect for the sender of the letter she did not prescribe to whether the name of Solomon seemed to appear before that of God or after, and she did not protect the letter from destruction for other than her

respect for the sender, and not possibly because of precedence of one name or another, or its contrary. And the consideration that Solomon preceded his name to that of God to protect the Name of God by the power of rulership and grandeur that Solomon's name produced in people, so that Bilqîs should not destroy the letter, such a consideration is not suitable with the degree of knowledge and servanthood of Solomon, that he should precede his name to that of God and precede the respect due to himself to that of God and appear with his own grandeur at the level of the grandeur of the Name of God. Thus all these possibilities do not exist.

In it (the letter) he mentioned the two Compassionate Beatitudes, the Compassion of all-bounty (*imtinân*) and the Compassion of necessarily-so-ness, and these two Compassionate Beatitudes are the *rahmân* and *rahîm* which are at the beginning of the letter where it reads: 'In the Name of the *rahmân* and the *rahîm*.' That is to say, he explained the singularity of the totality of the Divine Names contained in the Name of God with the Name *ar-rahmân* which denotes the Compassion of all-bounty, because the Compassion of all-bounty is general in all existence by virtue of the *rahmân* being the same as general being, because the Compassionate Beatitude of all of *rahmân* is the essential all-bounty, is general to the totality of the Names and realities. And: 'My Mercy extends over all things' leaves nothing outside of it, and is extended over the totality of things, even to the Names of God; High and Holy and Truth are all in singularity, are His Essential Ipseity, just as His Knowledge is. For instance, He says in the words of the angels: 'Our Lord had extended all things mercy-wise and knowledge-wise.'

The Name *ar-rahîm* denotes the Compassionate Beatitude of being, because Compassionate Beatitude by virtue of the necessities of inclination after being is particularly all Mercy.

The totality of the established potentialities are *rahmahtized* with the essential all-bounteous Compassion of Compassionate Beatitude, whereas in the *rahîm* there is a particularity of exaggeration in generalization. Thus, for the *rahîm* there is specific generalization from the *rahmân*, and for the *rahmân* there is generalized particularization from the *rahîm*, and the *a'yân* are not *rahmahtized* with the Compassionate Beatitude of the Compassion of necessarily-so-ness except after aptitude, that is to say, from the Most Holy Effusion with essential revelation and the *nafs-ar-rahmân*. Because of the generality of

the Compassionate Beatitude of *rahmân*, it is particular to each '*ayn*' from all the '*a'yân*' by virtue of that '*ayn*'s essential particularity. Solomon mentioned both *rahmahs*, because the one is the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty which is brought from and is the result of the Ipseity due to primary favour ('*inâyah*'), and this is called all-bounteous Compassionate Beatitude because it is not in response to an act from among the acts of the servant, but rather perhaps it is an essential favour, a past ungrudged kindness concerning the servant, and the other is the Compassionate Beatitude of necessarily-so-ness because it happens in response to an act, and this Compassionate Beatitude is called responsive (*wujûb*, necessarily-so) because God has written it upon His own Essence as necessarily responding, and: 'Wrote upon His own *nafs* the Compassionate Beatitude.'

Thus God became all-bounteous with the Name of *rahmân* over everything by generalizing the Compassionate Beatitude. By His saying that: 'My Compassion overrides My Anger', and because He makes it necessarily so that His *rahmah* prevails through the Name *rahîm*, that His Mercy prevails over all, He makes *rahmah*, overriding His Anger, become all-bounteous again, by virtue of His Mercy overriding everything. And this necessarily-so-ness is again all-bounty. Thus Mercy (*rahîm*) becomes comprised in the Compassion (*rahmân*) by comprehension of containment, because specification is a predication from among the general predications and is its branch. Thus the Name Merciful (*rahîm*) is included in the Name the Compassionate (*rahmân*). And the Merciful specializes generalization for Compassion, because God has written for Himself the Compassionate Beatitude so that by the inscription on His Essence God's necessarily answering with Compassionate Beatitude the servant's acts with such actions as are pleasing to God, the *rahmah* becomes the servant's due, as the servant acts according to what God has mentioned of obedience and belief. Hence God answers that servant with the Compassionate Beatitude, and God has imposed this Compassionate Beatitude especially for such a servant. In return for certain acts of the servant, God having imposed on His own Self the Compassionate Beatitude, this Compassionate Beatitude becomes the servant's due. Thus, that He imposes on Himself the Compassionate Beatitude in all the cases mentioned above, means that the necessarily-so Compassionate Beatitude is also all-bounty, and this is the meaning of the saying: 'And the *rahîm* entered the *rahmân*', because God having imposed upon

Himself a *rahmah* in all cases and made it necessarily so that He should respond with Compassionate Beatitude, is all-bounty, and in this consideration all Compassionate Beatitude is bounty, whether it be in consequence of acts or whether it be directly of all-bounty without any desert, and it is still all-bounty without any act by extending from all eternity. If a servant, for instance, deserves Compassion (*rahmah*) in response, which is specific Mercy, by virtue of his piety, that servant comes to know who it is that is the actor through him, or who it is that acts by him. That is to say, he comes to know that the actor in his place of manifestation, or again, the actor through the place of manifestation that he represents, is God, and that it is God who brings about those actions through the hand of the servant and manifests them. Thus, necessarily-so-ness and responsiveness also becomes all-bounty.

The acts of human beings are divided over eight members of the humankind. In other words, in the human being the members specially responsible to God for acts of belief are eight. The eye, the ear, the tongue, the hand, the belly, the female sexual organ, the male sexual organ, and the heart. And each of these members is specially responsible with the legal predications and religious works particular to it. God has necessitated Compassion and Mercy to be bestowed upon His own Self for the owners of these eight members in response to a pure and proper action emanating from these members. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, mentions these eight members in his book, *Mawâqî' al-Nujûm* (the Stations of the Stars). In a *ḥadīth* there is a mention of eight portions of the body which are known as the greatest parts of the body, and these are the two hands, the two feet, the two knees, and the forehead and the nose. But these eight members mentioned in the *ḥadīth* are specific for the prostration and do not appertain to the totality of the acts of the humankind. So understand.

And indeed God made it be known that He is the *huwiyyah* of each of these members by saying that: 'I become their hearing and their eyes and their hands and their feet', and these are eight. Thus, by the manifestation of the eight organs, or by the place of manifestation of the servant, the one who acts is no other than God, even though the image appertaining to the members belongs to the servant, and the *huwiyyah* of God is in the servant, that is to say, is included in the Name of the *ḥaqq*, and not otherwise. In other words, God is the same as each member, and the actor through each of the members is God

although the image is that of the servant, and the *huwiyyah* of God which is the actor in the servant is the Name of God in the servant and is included therein. Thus the servant is the Name of the *ḥaqq*, and the *huwiyyah* of God which is called the servant (*‘abd*) is the *huwiyyah* of God. Because the High God is the same as the thing which is called the immanence (*khalq*) and that which is manifest (*ẓâhir*), and because of this manifestation or because He is manifest and is called the immanence and is the same as the immanence, under these considerations the Name Manifest (*ẓâhir*) and the Name the Last (*âkhir*) came to happen for the servant, and equally because He was existent when the servant was non-existent and became realized when the servant was manifested, and that He became manifest with the servant, that the servant becomes manifest, and because He was existent when the servant was not existent and thus became manifest with the servant, that the servant became the last, and lastness became realized by that, and in his substance the *ḥaqq* is called Manifest and the Last, and this denotes that the *huwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq* is included in the servant. The manifestation of the servant is dependent on God, and the emanation of action from the servant is equally dependent on God. Thus the Name Interior (*bâṭin*) and the Name the First (*awwal*) became realized for God. That is to say, as the being of the servant is existent together with the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, thus it being dependent on the *ḥaqq*, the existentiator, the firstness (*awwaliyyah*) becomes realized for the *ḥaqq*, and as the emanation of action from the servant is dependent on the *huwiyyah* and interior of the servant which is dependent on the *ḥaqq*, the Name Interior (*bâṭin*) becomes established for the *ḥaqq*, because the *ḥaqq*, in the servant, is actor through the servant. The contrary is also possible, that is to say, the manifestation of the *ḥaqq*, together with the images of Divine totality, is dependent on the perfect servant. Thus the Name Interior (*bâṭin*) is realized for the servant, because when the *ḥaqq* becomes manifest in the universe of chaptering with the images of the revelation of Compassionate Beatitude, the perfect servant was interior therein. Thus, at that time, the image of Divine totality of the *ḥaqq* was equally interior and was dependent on the perfect servant for its manifestation, and as the emanation of action of the *ḥaqq* is dependent on the servant, the Name First (*awwal*) becomes established for the servant, because before the emanation of action of the *ḥaqq* from the place of manifestation of the being of the servant, the servant was established in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. And if

you have seen the immanence (*khālq*) you will see the First, the Last, the Manifest and the Interior. Firstness, lastness, manifestness or hiddenness is realized with the immanence, whether these qualifications are referred to the *ḥaqq* or whether they are referred to the *khalq*. The most perfect manifestation, the most total, the most complete witnessing, and the largest, is the existence of the Perfect Man, which is the last degree of being, and which is the seal and the end of the manifestation of immanence, and there is no existence more complete and more beautiful than his being so that after there being the Perfect Man the immanence be the last.

And Solomon was not ignorant of this Divine knowledge; rather that this knowledge was of that possession that was bestowed upon Solomon, so that it is not suitable for any other person to be manifested in the universe of witnessing with that same quality. The Shaykh put the special knowledge under the category of possession (*mulk*) because possession is the manifest estate, and knowledge is the secret estate, and the manifest estate together with the hidden estate and with the Divine knowledge is its spirit and results with it, because had there not been the spirituality of the Divine knowledge there would not be a possibility of *taṣarruf* in the possessions of immanences. In the case of the Perfect Ones and the *aqṭāb*, who are realized with the totality of essential servanthood and complete Divine knowledge, it is from the totality of their heart and the perfection of their reality that the totality of the Divine and immanential *taṣarruf* branches out, and because of their realization with the Presences of the Divine Names and their manifestation with viceregency, although by the order of God and the permission of God, the *taṣarrufs* in the higher and the lower universes are manifested from them, yet they are not manifest like Solomon with *taṣarruf* in the universe of witnessing. Each one of them, in his own time, is singular in *taṣarruf* like Solomon, but it is not necessary that all the people under his *taṣarruf* know that he is the *taṣarruf*-doer being manifest with the manifestation of rulership, because the Viceregents who are appointed with *taṣarruf* are qualified by servanthood, and the observance of servanthood prevents *taṣarruf*, especially the Perfect Man who is Viceregent, having deputized the *ḥaqq* for *taṣarruf* and turned his face to perfection with absolute servanthood, and being realized with total annihilation. Thus that person is not manifestly manifest with *taṣarruf*, even though in his place of manifestation the High God manifests the

totality of the infinite *taşarrufs*. That is why the Envoy (Mohammed) did not lift his head from servanthood to masterhood, and he said: 'I am a person, son of man, and have no special esteem. I am son of a woman, who eats food.' Indeed that knowledge which was not hidden to Solomon which is of that possession, it is not suitable for any one person to be manifest with that in the universe of witnessing after Solomon. However, to be manifest with *taşarruf* in possession is not of the totality of the Divine knowledges, because to the degree of increase of the *taşarruf* through *himmah* of the 'ârif, that much his knowledge is lacking, and to what degree his *taşarruf* is lacking, his knowledge will be higher, but Solomon is a *nabiyy*, and *anbiyâ*' are people of loosening and tightening (management) and they are supported with *taşarruf* and miracles in the apparent. And as Solomon pleaded from God the *taşarruf* over the jinn and Man and over the animals and birds and all together in the high and low universes, and God bestowed this on him, no *nabiyy* after him is manifested with that kind of *taşarruf*. In fact, what Mohammed was bestowed with was the same thing as Solomon was bestowed with, but Mohammed did not manifest with that in the universe of witnessing. God had given the possibility of conquest over the devil to Mohammed, and when the devil came to kill him at night Mohammed wanted to hold the afrit and tie him to one of the columns of the mosque so that he remained there until morning and that the children of Medina play with him, but Mohammed remembered Solomon's plea and gave up holding the devil. Thus the Envoy was not manifested in general with his power over things with which he was gifted, with which Solomon was manifested. After this, the words of Solomon, 'a possession', became general, and from this we understood that Solomon's wish was for a special possession, and we saw that in fact from each part of the possession that God bestowed on him, in each part there was indeed an associate. That is to say, in each possession that was bestowed on Solomon, in each of these portions, in that portion specifically there was a person who was associated to Solomon. From this we see that Solomon was not independent in *taşarruf* in his time in the totality of his possession, or that in each part, in the *taşarruf* of each part with which Solomon manifested, there was a *waliyy* who was associated to him in the *taşarruf*. Thus we came to know that Solomon was not independent of others except in the *taşarruf* of the totality of the portions of the possessions, which *taşarruf* was not private to him

because in each portion of the possession there was a specified person who was in *taṣarruf* in that portion, or it may also be that Solomon was independent in *taṣarruf* only for a specific portion of the possession from the total. With the *ḥadīth* concerning the demon, above-mentioned, we also came to know that Solomon was not specialized except in manifestation. The Envoy indeed is specialized in the total and in manifestation. That is to say, he is special to *taṣarruf* in the total of the parts, and to manifest with *taṣarruf*. Or it can also mean that with the *ḥadīth* concerning the demon we have come to know that Solomon was specialized for manifesting, and that the Envoy was with the *ḥadīth* concerning the demon but not to manifest with *taṣarruf*, and it also happens that Solomon is specialized for manifestation with *taṣarruf* in *taṣarrufing* over the totality of possessions. If the Prophet in the *ḥadīth* concerning the demon had not said that: 'God gave me power over the demon', we would have said, in fact, when the Envoy determined to take the demon, God made him remember the prayer of Solomon so that the Envoy know that the state is such that God will not give him power in holding the demon, and that the demon will be sent back unmolested. But as the Envoy said: 'God gave me the ability to do it', we came to know that indeed God had bestowed *taṣarruf* over the afrit, and that after that He made him remember, and he remembered the prayer of Solomon, and he acted in good form in accordance with that and did not appear with superiority over Solomon, and from this we came to know that after Solomon it is not suitable for any one person to manifest with *taṣarruf* in general. Our object with this question, apart from these words and their warning, is to point at those two *raḥmahs*, Compassionate Beatitudes, that Solomon mentioned them with two Names. The Arabic interpretation of these two Names is *ar-raḥmân*, *ar-raḥîm*, which means that the Names that Solomon used to mean *ar-raḥmân*, *ar-raḥîm*, are not the Arabic words *ar-raḥmân*, *ar-raḥîm*, but that the Arabic words *ar-raḥmân*, *ar-raḥîm*, are the meanings of these two words that Solomon used. Thus, what the Shaykh intends, the two Compassionate Beatitudes were attributed to the *ḥaqq* and that Solomon mentioned these two Compassions in two Names. And then the Shaykh begins to elaborate on these two Compassionate Beatitudes of God.

God conditioned the Compassion of answering, and made the Compassion of all-bounty absolute in His words: 'My Compassionate Beatitude extended over every thing.' This means even the Divine

Names, which are the same as the realities of relationship. Thus the Mercy concerning answering in necessarily-solitude is conditioned to those who are pious, and by transcending the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty, which is effusion of being over the essences of possibilities, and in the words: 'My Mercy is extended to all things', means that it extends also over the Divine Names, that is to say, to the realities of essential relationships, that is to say, those relationships with which the Names become differentiated one from the other, as the Names have two meanings, one of which is the particularity of the Ipseity with which Name that Name becomes differentiated from the other, and the other is the Ipseity due to Its own Itselfness, because in consideration of singularity every Name is the same as the Ipseity and the Ipseity is the same as that Name. Thus, under this consideration, there is no possibility of absoluteness since it is *rahmahtized* by the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty, but rather there is absoluteness in the relationship of its non-existence and its differentiating reality. Thus, that which is *rahmahtized* is the realities of non-existent relationships which are in annihilation in the Ipseity, the image of which becomes manifest in being by virtue of the essential aptitude of each one of them when they are relieved from the constriction of non-existence through the *nafs-i-rahmânî*, by the Breath of the Compassionate Self (Iipseity). Thus the realities of relationship are entered under the predications of generality which is in the words 'every thing', because the word 'thing' is prevalent to all existence and to all established non-existence.

The relationship is according to two faces. One of these relationships is the orders of non-existence and essentialities of considerations, and they have no realization in the essences except with the Truth of the Ipseity (the Ipseity of God), because relationship is of the Essence, like the meanings of Qualities like Life and Knowledge and Power and Ability and things like that which are related to God.

The other face is the relationship of this relationship, that is to say, everything that is relatable to God by virtue of this relationship is the relationship of the above-mentioned relationship, like sensibility and universality and ability. Thus, to this universality of relationship the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty is the intermediary. Where 'Arabi says: '*Fa-amtana 'alayha*', he means the totality of the essences of the unknowable and the essences of being of immanence,

and it is also more likely that this means the existence of the Perfect Ones, because even though the effects of the Names are manifest with the essences of being, in the essences of those who are other than the Perfect Ones the effects and the images of the totality of the Divine Names is not manifest. In each essence there is manifest the effect of one Name only, and only in the beings of the Perfect Ones, the *anbiyâ'* and the *awliyâ'*, the images and the effects of the totality of the Divine Names is manifest. And from the manifesting and the manifestation of the other essences, the ultimate cause in this way is the manifestation of God. Thus, the beings of the Perfect Ones with the Divine Names and the Lordly relationships and the essences of the unknowable and the essences of immanence and being, become the result of the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty, because even though the essences of the immanence are the result of the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty by virtue of the manifestation of the Names in partial manifestation in them, the essences of the universe in the partial results is not the total result, because that manifestation of the manifestation of the essences in the partial Names, by virtue of the turning towards the domain of transcendence of the essences of the Perfect Ones and the degree of the Perfect Man, it is still in constriction. Consequently, the partial manifestations and conditional beings of the essence which are in the universe become manifest in the degree of the Perfect Man with total and complete and isthmuseital manifestation, then the effects and the predications of the totality of the Divine Names also become manifest therein in manner of chaptering. Thus, the essences of the Perfect Ones become the total result for the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty, because the Perfect Man is the seal and the ultimate end for the results of the steps of the Divine and immanential realities, and as there is nothing but God it can be a result to nothing else, because the Perfect Man produces the desired result of God. Its result is God. Consequently, each one of the essences of being which is before and above the degree of the Perfect Man, in relationship to what is before it, is the result of the Compassionate Beatitude. But results which is the result of the last of the essences, which is the manifestation in the essences of the Perfect Ones, is the final total result, and because of this consideration the essences are the results of the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty. Understand this. The High God extended all-bounty over the Names with our non-existential unknowable realities, because the Divine Names were in annihilation

in the Ipseity of God and it is with the Compassionate Self (*nafs-i-rahmânî*) that they became individuated and differentiated one from the other with the images of knowledge in the mirrors of our *a'yân-i-thâbita*, and the *nafs-i-rahmânî* with the revelation of being extended in all-bounty over the Names even after our being, with and through our manifested existences, because the effects of the Names are manifested by virtue of the places of manifestation in our manifestation. Indeed we are the result of the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty which is the Divine Names and the relationships of Lordship, through our *a'yân-i-thâbita* and manifested beings, because God mercified the Names in our mirrors of *a'yân-i-thâbita* by manifesting therein their images and by manifesting their predications and effects through our manifested beings. Consequently, we are the results of the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty for the Divine Names and the relationships of Lordship since God mercified them through our essences.

Then God confirmed the Mercy over His own Self when our realities and our selves became manifest to us, and when we came into gnosis of ourselves, because gnosis of the self is the result and reality of piety which necessitates the Compassionate Beatitude of Compassion of necessarily-so-ness. Thus God imposed upon Himself to *rahmahtize* us through the Compassionate Beatitude of Mercy of necessarily-so-ness, and made us know that He is our *huwiyyah* and that we know Him, and God made us know that in reality He is our *huwiyyah* so that we know that in fact God did not confirm Mercy upon His own Self except because of Himself, because His Self is the same as our *huwiyyah*. Thus, Compassionate Beatitude of Compassion did not go out of the *haqq*, and by virtue of reality and union God is both the mercifier and the mercified. That is to say, at the level of the dominance of the predication of the uniqueness of Essence (*aḥadiyyatu-l-'ayn*) where the totality of the individuated beings are baptized (*munsabighat* — dyed or baptized) with the singular existence of God, and there remaining no other in individuation than the single Being of God in the apparent or the hidden, and when it becomes manifest that God is the mercifier and the mercified, on what can God expand His all-bounty when there is nothing else but Him in being? There is only this, that it is inevitable that from the predication of the manner of speaking of chaptering, because in knowledge the superiority of the immanence became manifest so that it is necessary to say that in fact this is most known, that from this through the

singularity of Essence, that is to say, with regard to the plurality of relationship which is in the Intellect, it is inevitable and necessary that it be chaptered, because the essences are dissimilar in their aptitude where it regards strength and weakness, largeness and oppressiveness, and closeness to the real balance or distance. Thus, for a person whose aptitude is of the strongest, one says he is more knowledgeable than that other whose aptitude is lower, whereas the reality of the humankind is one, and in the same way the Uniqueness of God is also the Uniqueness of the Ipseity, but it is various in manifestation by virtue of the inclinations and aptitudes of the essences which are the intellectual relationships. And the meaning, that is to say, of the superiority, is the meaning of the lack of appertaining to the Divine Will as compared with the superiority of appertaining to Knowledge. This superiority is in the Divine Qualities because the appertaining to the Divine Will is less than the appertaining to Knowledge, and appertaining to Knowledge is superior and more general because Will is subject to Knowledge; thus Knowledge is more general and prevailing than Will which is subject to it, because the appertaining of Knowledge to things known is more general than the appertaining of Will to things known, because Will appertains to a number of knowledges by specifying and appointing the Will to appertain to that number, whereas all things are known to God at all times and God is in knowledge of those, and God is never removed from being qualified by the quality of Knowledge, but Will does not apply all the time to all things because God does not will those things at all times, and at those times it is not necessary to qualify them by the quality of Will, like it is said: 'When We will, We tell them "Be" and they are.' Consequently, the appertainment of Will being less than the appertainment of Knowledge, it becomes necessary that there is superiority among the Divine Qualities, and when superiority is established among the Divine Qualities it also becomes apparent in the essences of immanence which are the places of manifestation of the Divine Qualities. The meaning of the appertaining of the completeness and superiority and increase of the Will over the appertaining of Power, since the appertaining of Will is more general than the appertaining of Power, as Power does not appertain to anything unless Will specifies the Power for a purpose, then Knowledge determines over Will and Will determines over Power, so that when the Will specifies Power to bring about a thing, Power brings into existence that thing.

In the same way, Divine Hearing and Vision and all the Divine Names are in degrees of superiority of some to the other, and in the immanence this superiority is manifest in saying this is more knowledgeable than the other, when it is all from the singularity of Essence (*aḥadiyyatu-l-ʿayn*), because superiority, having become established in the origin of things which are the Names, becomes established primordially in things which are the branches and places of manifestation of Names by virtue of the expansion and prevalence of the superiority of the Names which are the origins of things. Even if you preceded one Name over the other of the Divine Names, that is to say, if you put it at the place as the subject as the one which is called by it, you will call that Name by all the Names and you will qualify it by all the Names, because by consideration of the uniqueness of the Names it has capacity for being qualified by all the Names, because in the singularity the Names and Qualities are the same as the Ipseity, and in individuation and manifestation the *huwiyyah* of God is included in the Names. Thus, whichever Name you put in the first place from among the Names, whether they be totally dominant or partially subject, it is called by all the Names. In the same way, in things that are manifested through the immanence, which are the places of manifestation of the Names, it is like that. They have the capacity in them for everything through that thing with which they have been rendered superior. That is to say, if everything is rendered superior, at their level there is capacity for everything over which they are superior. Consequently, every portion of the universe is the totality of the universe. That is to say, it has the ability to receive the varied realities of the totality of the universe. In other words, they have the ability to receive the manifestation of all the meanings and properties which are varied in the totality of the universe. (In some copies, instead of 'varied', the word 'singularized' is used.)

When we say that Zayd is lower in knowledge than 'Amr, we mean Zayd is lower than 'Amr does not deter from the fact as when we say that the *huwiyyah* of God is the same as that of Zayd and 'Amr. In other words, when we say that in knowledge Zayd is less than 'Amr, it does not change the fact that the *huwiyyah* of God is the same as Zayd and 'Amr (and the *huwiyyah* which manifests in 'Amr, to that *huwiyyah* being more perfect and more knowledgeable than the *huwiyyah* which manifests in Zayd), because the *huwiyyah* in Zayd and 'Amr is one, and the superiority is in the personality and individuation, just as the

Divine Names are superior one to the other, like the Knower, the Willer and the Powerful, when all the Names are no other than God. Thus the High God, by virtue of being the Knower, is more general in appertaining than the consideration of being the Willer and the Powerful, and it remains that He is He; the one who is the Knower, the Willer and the Powerful is God and no other. Oh *waliyy* (saint, or my beloved), do not know God in one place of manifestation if you are ignorant of Him in another place of manifestation. Do not establish Him with one quality in one place of manifestation if you deny Him with one quality in another place of manifestation. In other words, do not know God in one place of manifestation of your own self, and do not establish Him in that place of manifestation and particularize Him there, if you deny Him and do not recognize Him in another place of manifestation, and do not know that other place as devoid of the face of God. Rather, know Him and establish Him in all places of manifestation in consideration of the receptivity of that place.

Let it be in no other way but that you do establish God in the way that God established and proved His own Self, and that you keep Him away from certain qualifications in the same way that He denied certain qualifications to Himself, like in that verset which contains completely the proving of God by Himself, when He established His own Self and denied anything equal to it, as when He said: 'There is no thing like it', whereby He denied likeness, and He said: 'He is the Hearer and the Seer', thus establishing the *haqq* with a quality which is general to all creatures alive, and to all who hear and see. The fact is that there is not in existence other than which is alive (*hayawân* = creature or animal), because the Divine *huwiyyah* being fluent in the totality of existence necessitated the presence of life and knowledge and ability and hearing and seeing, and total qualities other than these, and partial qualities, in everything that exists, and knowledge and life and other qualities exist even in those, but is not apparent in some of the existents. The veiled ones think that life does not exist in some, and that is why he called some of them animals and others not, and called them inanimate objects, but the Shaykh warns very clearly that there is not a thing in existence which has no life. In no other way than like this that life on earth became hidden in certain cases from the comprehension of some people. The totality of existence is in effect alive, and for the people of God it is known that life is contained in all existents. It is because it is interior and hidden from some people that

the speech of the 'inanimate' objects is inaudible, when all speech is by nature audible, and this will be so apparent to everybody in the other world, because the other world is the place of animals, just as the world is the world of animals, except that in this world the life of this world is hidden from some of the people so that there be among the servants of God specialization, and that there appear manifest a certain singularity among them so that they comprehend that from the realities of the universe. In other words, because they comprehend certain things from the realities of the universe there comes specialization and superiority among them because there is difference between the comprehension of one from the other. The Caliph 'Ali said: 'We were journeying with the Envoy and we did not meet a stone or a tree whom the Envoy did not greet.' Hence the word 'whom' indicates life which is the sense in the animal (anima, animal = *ḥayy*, *ḥayawân*), and the mention of that is in consideration of *ḥayawân* (animal).

Thus, when a person in the immanence attains a degree of comprehension which is general, God becomes more manifest in determination in him. In comparison to that other person this generality of comprehension did not occur. Thus the person whose comprehension is general witnesses that the world is the abode of the animal and that all things are alive (*ḥayy*). So you do not become veiled, be superior when you are already persuaded of the truth, when a person's words are not true, when you are convinced, when you have agreed that the immanence (*khalq*) is the *huwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq* and that the *huwiyyah* of the immanence is no other than the *huwiyyah* of God and it is the same. It is not true for a person who is convinced of the truth to say I have shown you the superiority of some of the Divine Names to the others, and that you do not doubt now that the Divine Names are God and their senses by which they are called is other than God, and thus the Names in circumference and pervasion are one superior to the other. However, the sense of the totality of the Divine Names is God, who is One Existent and One 'ayn, and because of the plurality of the immanent images do not become veiled from the oneness of the *huwiyyah* of God which is fluent in them, and do not establish for the immanence any other *huwiyyah* than the *huwiyyah* of God, so that you become of the victorious *muwahḥidin*. Thus the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, having mentioned the superiority which exists among the Names and among the *khalq*, returns to what he had aimed at.

After all this, how is it possible for Solomon to put his name before the Name of God as some people thought, whereas Solomon is of the totality of the existents that were existentiated by the Compassionate Beatitude of Compassion? Therefore he is mercified by the Compassionate Beatitude of Compassion, and in the same way, as he is specialized for perfection he is also *rahmahtized* by the Compassionate Beatitude of Mercy. Thus it is inevitable that the Name *rahmân* and *rahîm* should be placed before Solomon's name so that the dependence of Solomon, which is *rahmahtized*, upon the Mercifier, which is existentiator, become veridic, because it is necessary to precede the Mercifier to the mercified so that the mercified becomes dependent on the Mercifier, and if it is not so, the word 'Mercifier' cannot be applied to it. The words which have been enunciated concerning Solomon are against the truth (saying that Solomon's name was before God). What follows is to explain the words against the truth and to comment on them. To precede (anteriorize) the person which deserves posteriorization, and to posteriorize that which deserves anteriorization, which is the Name of God, in a subject where it deserves anteriorization, is against the necessities of knowledge of truths, and the reason why Ibn 'Arabi added at the end of his sentence: '... in a subject where it deserves anteriorization' is because it is necessary that at the beginning of all order is preceded with the Name of God, especially at the beginning of words and the text of the letter and in opening up on the subject of invitation to God. That is why the Prophet said: 'Every order which does not begin with the Name of God is barren.'

It is because Bilqîs was wise and knowledgeable and that her degree in knowledge was high that she said that the letter was thrown to her, without naming Solomon, and she did this to let her people know that there were many ways other than through them for reaching her, and she had access to many more orders and mysteries, and that her people do not know all the ways and orders. Consequently, they fear for themselves in such cases. Her not mentioning the person who threw the letter, and hiding the way the letter was notified to her, is of the Divine caution in administration of government, because if the way news reached Bilqîs is hidden from the people in the government, the government fear for their own selves and do not dispense with orders as when that order has arrived to their ruler from themselves, because then they knew how they have brought it to the ruler and how to

counteract, but if it is hidden and unknown to them the way the news has arrived to the ruler, fearing for their selves they dispense with justice, rectitude, and with compassion over the people. Thus the country becomes stabilized in order. If they knew through what way and when their ruler received news, they would act in a way to be pleasing to that source of information, and would serve it and even offer it gratuities so that they themselves do what they want in the country and it would not reach the knowledge of the ruler. When Bilqîs mentioned that the letter was thrown to her without mentioning that it came from Solomon, Bilqîs showed statesmanship, and caused among the great and cautious statesmen a certain caution towards the statesmanship of Bilqîs, and this knowledge allowed Bilqîs to have precedence over the men that were in power in her country. Consequently, she acquired precedence in rulership among them, and her rulership held the determinations and dispensations in the country.

As concerns the superiority of the knowledgeable person from among human beings (i.e. Asaf ibn Barkhiya') to the knowledgeable person from among the jinn in the mysteries of *taṣarruf* and the essences of things, it can be known by the value of time, because the return of the look to the looker is quicker than the getting up of a person who is sitting in a gathering (in company), because the movement of the eye comprehends what it has to comprehend quicker than the movement of the body. The time it takes for the eye to move is the same as the time it takes to reach what it views over the distance between he who is looking and the one that is looked at, and the time it takes to open the eye is the time it takes to reach the sphere of the fixed stars, and the time it takes the sphere of fixed stars to reach the eye is the same time; thus it is quicker for sight to reach the eye of the looker than for a person to get up from his seat in the gathering. Because the knowledgeable jinn said to Solomon: 'I will bring it to you before you get up from your place', whereas the knowledgeable human, which was Asaf, said: 'I will bring it to you before you open and shut your eyes.' Because for the eye to reach its object is quicker than a man getting up from the company. In reaching the object of the vision, the eye is quicker than the movement of the body, because that time in which the eye is in movement is the same as the time when the eye reaches the object of vision, even though there is certainly distance between the seer and what is seen, because the time for the opening of the eye is the time of its reaching the sphere of the fixed stars,

and the time for the return of what is the object of the vision, or the object of the eye, is the same time as the non-reaching of the vision to it. In other words, the opening of the eye towards the object of vision is the same time as the eye reaching that object, and the return of the object of vision to the person looking is the same time as the non-reaching of the vision, but the getting up of a man from where he is sitting is not like this because there is not such speed in it, because the getting up of a body from its place is the time of its movement, which is possible of division. Consequently, transportation in movement would also be subject to time, but the movement of the eye is instantaneous and does not allow division beyond zero. Consequently, transportation in that manner is also instantaneous, without time. Thus Asaf ibn Barkhiya' became more complete in work. The words of Asaf ibn Barkhiya' become the same as the action in one and the same time. That means that what Asaf said about bringing the throne before your sight reaches the object of vision and returns, became the same as his action. In other words, his saying that he would bring the throne became the same as his having brought it, and in that instant Solomon saw the throne of Bilqîs standing in front of him. God says: 'And Solomon saw it standing near him', so that people do not imagine that Solomon thought he saw the throne without the throne having been transported from Sheba.

Now let it be known like this, that Asaf ibn Barkhiya' was supported by God and was with the permission of God, and confirmed by it with constructive ability from the universe of power. God had bestowed on him dispensing in the universe of immanence with *himmah* and power of *malakût*. Thus he dispensed in the case of the throne of Bilqîs; having dissolved the matter of the image of the throne in Sheba, brought it into existence in front of Solomon. Thus, the coming of the throne of Bilqîs to the presence of Solomon is neither by transporting it from one place to the other, nor by while it stood in its original place its image was made visible to Solomon at another place. For the throne, there was not anything left to be done that Asaf knew when he said: 'I will bring it to you', other than dispensing through power, and the time it took for him to say to Solomon: 'I will bring it to you' was the same time as when the throne was non-existent in Sheba and was existent near Solomon. This bringing about is of the same kind of total dispensing which God had bestowed as miracle to Solomon by giving it as a great gift of dispensing to some of the people around Solomon,

because this kind of dispensing concerning Solomon is greater if it comes through people around him than directly through himself. This dispensing is the highest degree from among the degrees of dispensing. God gives this power to whom He desires from among His servants. This dispensing in re-bringing into existence in immanence results from the perfection of knowledge. Effusion of existence and the excellence of the *nafs-i-rahmânî* is in constant fluency in the essences of the immanence, like water runs in the river, which becomes renewed constantly as the flowing continues. In the same way, the engravings, the lines and images of the universe which are manifested in the mirror of the Being of God, the individuations of the Being of God in ancient Knowledge in the images of the *a'yân-i-thâbita*, in the same way are ceaselessly renewed, and it happens sometimes that the *ta'ayyun awwal*, which is the individuation of existence, becomes deposed from some of the *a'yân* in certain contexts, and the second *ta'ayyun* (*ta'ayyun thâni*) which follows it, in a latter context joins it. It is not the joining of the second *ta'ayyun* when the *'ayn* is established in the Divine Knowledge and in the universe of the unknowable, but it is the manifestation of the knowledge of the *'ayn* in this context and its suppression in the previous context. Thus, since Asaf knew the meaning of new creation (*khalq-i-jadîd*) and was certain in that, and as he was specialized and appointed with dispensing in immanential existence by God, God bestowed him as counsellor to Solomon and made him his minister, and with his help gave further strength to Solomon in consideration of miracles and munificence, and in the completion of his munificence in the subjugation of the jinn and humans and birds and animals, and by virtue of raising the power of Solomon and aggrandizing his rulership, made him powerful over Asaf. That means that Solomon and for his kingdom bestowed more zeal and energy, and Asaf was bestowed as zeal and energy by God for Solomon, so that the jinn do not imagine that the *taṣarruf* that God has bestowed upon them is more perfect and more superior to the dispensing of Solomon and his counsellors.

By this *taṣarruf*, Asaf made it known to the jinn that this possession and dispensing which is given to some of the counsellors of Solomon is superior and more complete to what is usual, like that which was given specifically to the jinn for heavy duty which is beyond the strength of Man, and by consideration of thought and vision is outside the ordinary use. What Asaf did was to remove the image of the throne

in Sheba from the existence of that throne and make the very same image of that throne existent near Solomon in the same moment, because the *ḥaqq* is the same as the powers and means of the Perfect Ones. Consequently, words and action are also of the *ḥaqq*; and Solomon was *nabiyy* and the *quṭb* of his time and was a dispenser with gentleness in the universe, and the *aqṭâb* and Viceregents, because of their qualification with complete servanthood and total poverty and self-abnegation, do not dispense in an order when it concerns their own selves, and if from their successors and their ministers an order comes out pertaining to themselves they say nothing, because of their perfect abandonment of themselves to the dispensing of the *ḥaqq*, and because of the form suitable towards the *ḥaqq*. That is why the *ḥaqq* completed the possession of Solomon with Asaf, and just as He gave all-bounty to Solomon He also gave all-bounty to the *aqṭâb* with the presence of the perfect beings and with the presence of those who have arrived, so that they are not afflicted with the counsel of the ignorants, but rather bestowed on them the counsel of the knowledgeable people and gnostics and pure believers so that they bear the burden of that which is heavy and can be delegated, and carry out their predications and orders and have them put into action.

Let it be known like this, that the jinn are strong spirits, and they are subtle and corporeal bodies. They are under the dominion of the jewel of fire and air. We are under the domination of the jewels of earth and water. The elements of earth and water are heavy elements. Because of the strength of their spirits and the subtleness of the jewels of their bodies, God has given them power to appear in different forms, and like the quick action of the angels they are established with actions beyond the ability of Man. Only this much is different, that the spirits of the jinn are lower spirits and the angels are heavenly spirits.

When the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, speaks of the time it takes for the movement of the eye etc., and where it reaches the sphere of the fixed stars, and in other places, when he uses the word 'time', he means 'instant' (*ân*), and *ân* is that time which does not accept division. And for us there did not happen the transportation of the throne, the union of time, which means union of the time is the union of the time when the movement of vision unites with the object of vision, and Asaf had promised to bring the throne before that time. Had there been transportation it could not have happened in this manner. Non-existence and re-existence happened in such a manner in the

presence of Solomon that no one knew how it happened except that person who is cognizant of non-existence and re-existence and who knew how to witness the new creation at every instant. And the lack of knowledge among people of the non-existence and re-existence is according to the words of God, who says: 'They are in ignorance of the new creation.' Those who are in ignorance of the new creation do not see that the thing they are observing becomes non-existent and that it becomes existent again, and as there is no time between these two they see it as though it was a continuous existence, whereas in the universe the existence of everything is of the order of the new creation. Since, as we said, the happening of the throne near, in the presence of, Solomon, is like what we have said, that it happened through re-existence and non-existence, the disappearance of the throne in Sheba from its place and its re-existence near Solomon became the same time, and this disappearance and reappearance of the throne is like the renewal of the *kawn* through breath or moment, yet there is no such quantity of knowledge in one person. But the re-existence of the throne and the non-existence of it is in the same category of the recreation of the *kawn*. However, Man is not even conscious of this happening in his own self, that he is non-existent at every breath and then again is, and he is ignorant, even though he himself is the closest thing to himself, that at every breath he is inexistent in his own self and that he is existent again with the existence of the *haqq*. This is because the possibility of the human being necessitates that he be inexistent continuously at all times, and the essential revelation necessitates his existence at all times. Rather that the revelations of active Names require his immanencing after his non-existing continuously without ceasing, at the same time where time which requires relationship of before and after, or perhaps even an intellectual and spiritual before and after, because due to the necessity of the '*ayn*' of possibility there is in the servant an unbroken and perpetual non-existence, and due to the revelations of the singularity of the Ipseity existence is continuous and perpetual, and there is individuation of things which are followed by moments and breaths by virtue of the necessity of the revelation of the Names, because the persons who are individuated with this individual existence are instantaneously renewed. So don't you say there was not and *then* there was, because the word 'and then' requires time and lapse of time; so you say instead, Man is at every breath in non-existence of being and its non-existence is the same time of its being,

and that includes no beforeness or afterness. It is not true that the word 'then' always necessitates time. Yet the word 'then' necessitates in the Arabic usage in certain specific matters the precedence of higher degree, like in: 'Then it covered the sky . . .', and also in the saying: 'Then he was of the ones that believed.' In these cases the precedence indicated does not at all mean there was time between the creation of the heavens and of the earth; like when the poet says: 'The spear jolted and then shook' there is certainly no time passed to denote 'then' between its jolting and shaking, because jolting is the cause of its shaking and there is no time between the cause of a thing and a thing that is caused. Jolting contains the meaning of movement, and the movement of the jolt is shaking. There is without a doubt no time between the two happenings. Exactly like in the poet's use of the time of jolting and the time of shaking which are both the same time, in the re-existence of the immanence with breaths or moments, the time of its non-existence is the time of its existence, like the Ash'arites infer in the renewal of accident, because the Ash'arites infer that two times do not remain in accident.

The question of bringing the throne of Bilqîs is one of the most difficult questions at the level of the usual intellect, except for those people who know what we have mentioned above. For them there would be no difficulty. There is no superiority attached to Asaf in bringing the throne through non-existentiating and re-existentiating except in the fact of actually bringing it to the presence of the council of Solomon, because all things are in re-existentiating of the immanence. The bringing about of the individuations which follow each other and the appearance of one existence in the image of the throne of Bilqîs, or the manifestation of the image of the throne in the Being of God, or the following of each other of existences, are all because of the following of one and other of the revelations. All of these are special to God. For Asaf there is no other than bringing about this re-existence in the council of Solomon by re-individuating it in that council by intention, and this re-existentiating is equally, in the matter of Asaf, established for God. Yet the language of teaching necessitates what the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, drew, which is that the bringing about, the non-existentiating and the re-existentiating, on account of the apparent, has to be attributed to Asaf. No distance was traversed by the throne. There was no travel over distance and the earth was not folded for it, nor was it like *ṭayy-i-maqâm*, nor was there

a traversing of the country or piercing of it, and the understanding of this is special to that person like we have mentioned, that he understand this with certitude. This bringing about and *taşarruf* happened to be in the hands of some of the companions of Solomon, so that in the council, if there were any of the companions of Bilqîs, Solomon appeared greater. So as to aggrandize Solomon and elevate his power that God made some of the companions of Solomon with great acts, deeds, and straight (strong) *taşarruf*, and to let the people present know that Solomon's honour is grand; seeing that one of the people around him could act this way with such power, what would Solomon's own power be if it were to manifest? However, if the student manifests with such power, his teacher's power does not become known and he remains unknown of power, and among the people of God this is the utmost of aggrandizement, because the servant reaches a degree where as he is realized with the *ḥaqq* there would be similarity and plurality attributed to him because he is in the same way as his origin unknown of essence of ipseity, and this is the utmost degree where the branch joins the original. As God says: 'It was not he who was able. God, the Truth, was able.'

If Solomon had manifested through himself and had brought about things and done *taşarruf*, the present people would probably imagine that this is the power of Solomon and that this power is the ultimate, but it is not like this, because the ultimate of the people of God is in being impotent of everything and this is of the completion of knowledge, because people of knowledge do not want that there should be throngs in Divinity and that there should happen to emerge a state of *shirk* from *taşarruf*, and this is due to the perfection of differentiation. *Taşarruf* is special to the people of *himmah* from among the People of the Middle. And the reason for this, that is to say, the reason for the specialization that resulted for Solomon and his companion Asaf, is the fact that Solomon is a gift of God to David. In other words, it is because God gave Solomon as a present to David and because Solomon is a gift. This is a gift from the Gift-giver. It is not a bestowal through desert or through recompense and earning. So Solomon's existence is for David past Divine bounty ('*inâyah*) and the Compassionate Beatitude of all-bounty, because the *a'yân-i-thâbita* of both David and Solomon required it to be so. Thus, the being of Solomon is for David a growing and completing gift of benevolence and is a proof without doubt against his enemies and a cleaving stroke to the

opposers and those who cover up the Truth. Solomon being bounty to David is because the manifested Divine viceregency thus becomes completed in David and its perfection is manifested in Solomon, and this cleaving stroke is pointer to this perfection. In other words, his being is purified from appertainances of immanence and is struck with the seal of the Lordly Qualities and Divine Names and is accounted for in the station of perfection so that his jewelness will never diminish. And from this gift of God which is Solomon to David, it becomes so that the specialization which is particular to Solomon and his companion Asaf is also a gift of God.

As to Solomon's specialization in knowledge, it emanates from the words of God: 'And We have made Solomon understand.' That is to say, Solomon was specialized for understanding and learning from God, and his knowledge came through God's making him understand and teaching him. In the story of the sheep, God says: 'We made it understood by Solomon concerning the question.' In other words, We made Solomon comprehend what it all meant, and We bestowed this on him. And to understand a thing as it is, from God and from the knowledge of God, is Divine knowledge, because God alone knows things as they are. And just as Solomon was given as a gift to David, this understanding and comprehension was a gift to Solomon. Thus, when Solomon judged in the story of the sheep he did so through the instruction of God, even though when his judgement was in opposition to that of David. The Shaykh points out by the opposition in judgement, where Solomon's judgement annuls that of David, that it was God who made Solomon understand what judgement should be given. In the same way, it is God who bestows the knowledge to all those who have to give judgement over those who are created universes, mankind and angels and genii. David's knowledge was adductive common-sense knowledge bestowed on him by God, because he is included in God's words: 'We gave them judgement and knowledge.' In the matter of the sheep, Solomon's knowledge is Divine knowledge, because that which is dominant in Solomon without intermediary is God Himself, and thus Solomon became the interpreter of God in the seat of faithfulness and the place of manifestation of God, and He who was judging and dominant was God Himself. Consequently, David's knowledge is bestowed knowledge from the Presence of *wahhâb* and Gift-giver, whereas Solomon's knowledge is essential Divine knowledge and he judged according to what is known in the

Divine Knowledge. And the Shaykh points out, by saying he was judging without intermediary, to the fact that at the level of essential revelation Solomon's humanity was annihilated, and what was judging in the image of Solomon was God, as instructed to Solomon, just as He appeared to Moses in the image of the bush and talked to Moses through it. In the same way He appeared in the place of manifestation of Solomon in revelation and judged in the matter of the sheep. The predication which happens through the persons to whose share it has fallen to solve a difficult case of canonical law within the predication of God, through which predication God predicates in a certain question, and if that person who were to undertake to manage or administer to that question with that which has been inspired to the envoy of God, or through his own *nafs*, there would be rewards resultant for him in response, two rewards that had been in response to his solving rightly and hitting the mark, and it is response to one reward of that man's utmost endeavour (*ijtihād*). And within this specific predication in which the man of utmost endeavour happens to be placed is in error, again a reward happens for him and that recompense is his utmost endeavour, because the erroneous predication is still included in the saying: 'We gave them knowledge and judgement', and it is suitable to act according to this predication until the error becomes manifest, because during that time still the error of the one who has done his utmost is not apparent, because time is utmost endeavour and every person of utmost endeavour thinks himself as solving rightly and hitting the mark. But when the Divine law becomes manifest through Mohammed, according to which law the Envoy and his friends were established without utmost endeavour, the different beliefs become lifted away and it all becomes one form of belief which is the one brought down to the Envoy of God from God, and that belief is established through Divine inspiration and not through utmost endeavour. If the beliefs are different they are not according to the law of Mohammed but they are according to the laws of utmost endeavour, and they are different because of the difference of the people who exert utmost endeavour in solutions, and this is not agreed to generally because it is not according to *yaqīn* but according to conjecture, but Mohammedan law which is particular to the time of Mohammed is generally accepted and there is no difference in it. To this Mohammedan people is given the rank of Solomon in predication, and rank of David, so that they hit the mark as in the case of Solomon and

that when they are in error in utmost endeavour and when that utmost endeavour happens to be contradicted, and see how He has given superiority (munificence, God's grace) to these people!

And when Bilqîs saw the throne, knowing about distance and knowing that it was impossible to transport the throne in that time, she said: 'It is as if it were it.' That is to say, when Asaf brought the throne, Solomon said: 'Cunning her her throne', and they concealed it, cunninged it, by asking her: 'Is this your throne?', and Bilqîs equally cunninged over them and answered with the declension of denial, cunningness, which is the declension of similarity, and did not say: 'It is it', because she knew of the distance and the time it would take for the throne to be transported, and in conformity to the renewal of being she brought in the letter *kaf* of similarity and answered: 'It looks like it', but did not say: 'It is it'; and Solomon, knowing the order in his own *nafs*, said: 'Is it like this?', and did not say: 'This is your throne.' So Bilqîs, being guided with success and knowing the order, answered in accordance with Solomon's question and by virtue of the happening of the order as it was, and Bilqîs was truthful and hit the mark according to what we have said from the renewal of creation with similarities. That is to say, as the throne by virtue of its image was it, Bilqîs was truthful in saying: 'It is as if it was it.' All the same, the throne which was in the presence of Solomon was the throne which was in Sheba by virtue of the reality of the throne and the specific knowledge of the '*ayn* of the essence, and it was not by virtue of materializing a being, and the order is truthful by Bilqîs saying: 'It is as if it is', and because it was it in reality. All the same, in the time of renewal you are the same as you were in the past; according to this consideration you are what you were, and you are not by consideration of the renewal of creation.

After this, it is also of the plenitude of Solomon's knowledge that awareness of consequence in the mention of the palace, that is to say, he made her aware of the renewal of creation. He said to Bilqîs: 'Enter the palace', and the palace floor was smooth and there were no waves in it. It was of glass, that is, the floor of the palace was like marble, made of clear white glass, and there was water under it and in the water there were fish. When Bilqîs saw the floor of the palace she thought it was water and lifted up her skirts from both sides so that her dress would not get wet. By virtue of the similarity of images, the order became ambiguous (doubtful) to Bilqîs. Solomon made Bilqîs aware

through the palace floor that though she thought it might be something else, that it is the same in the case of her throne, and this is the utmost of moderation (sense of justice) in Solomon for Bilqīs, making it known to Bilqīs that in her saying: 'It is as if . . .', she was right; just as she had thought the palace floor was made of water, after entering she found it was in fact of white glass. In the same way, Bilqīs had thought that the throne was as if it was hers, but in reality that it was. And at the level of Solomon's sense of justice and moderation, Bilqīs said: 'Lord, indeed I have oppressed my *nafs*, and I have covered the Truth and I have associated (*shirk*). By retarding believing up to now I have oppressed my *nafs*, and I repent totally. I have surrendered completely to God, who is the God of the universes, with the surrender of Solomon.' Bilqīs did not submit to Solomon but rather perhaps to the Lord of the universes, even though Solomon is of the universes. In fact, perhaps Bilqīs by saying 'Lord of Solomon' did not qualify her submission, but transcended it and absolutized it by saying 'the Lord of the universes', because Lord is absolute, just as in the case of the envoy who did not relativize and qualify in his belief. In other words, the belief of the envoy is not particular to a private Lord, but rather their belief is according to absoluteness of the Lord of Lords which is the Absolute Lord, because they know that God is the Lord of the universes and each thing's Lordship is particular to a Name. Therefore, their beliefs and submission is not particularized to a specific Lord, but their beliefs and submission is according to absoluteness.

The Pharaoh's submission and belief is in opposition to the belief and submission of Bilqīs because the Pharaoh said: 'Lord of Moses and Aaron', thus he qualified it and did not say like Bilqīs did: 'I submit with Solomon to God, Lord of the universes', thereby absolutizing it. Even though the Pharaoh's relative submission is in some way conjunctive to the submission of Bilqīs which is absolute, still it is not as strong as the strength of the submission of Bilqīs. Pharaoh had qualified his belief with the words: 'I believe in what the *bani* Israel believe in', and the Shaykh said that the Pharaoh qualified his belief by the words 'Lord of Moses and Aaron', but the Pharaoh had not said 'Lord of Moses and Aaron', yet the belief of the sons of Israel was to the Lord of Moses and Aaron, and to have said: 'I believe in that which the *bani* Israel believe in' is the same as saying: 'I believe in the Lord of Moses and Aaron', because Pharaoh saw the magicians who said 'Lord of Moses and Aaron', and so he said: 'I believe in what the

people of Israel believe in', and meant by that 'Lord of Moses and Aaron', and with these words conditioned his belief, whereas Bilqîs transcended it and absolutized it by saying 'Lord of the universes'. In one way the conditioning of Pharaoh can be contiguous to the absolutization of Bilqîs because the Lord of Moses and Aaron is the Lord of the universes, but all the same it will not be as strong a submission as that of Bilqîs, because Bilqîs' submission is explicit (*taşrîh*) and universal (*tarmîn*) whereas that of Pharaoh was restricted, implied (*tađmîn*) and specialized (*takhşîş*). Thus Bilqîs was more apposite, more conforming and more knowledgeable in submission to God, because as she explicitly mentioned her submission to the Lord of the universes there was not anything left in the Presence of Lordship from among the Lords of the Names, so that she submit to them by implication, as she submitted explicitly and clearly to the Lord of Lords and the Lord of the universes which contains them all. Bilqîs clearly expressed (*taşrîh*) the submission of the total and implied (*tađmîn*) the submission of the parts, whereas the Pharaoh explicitly (*taşrîh*) expressed the submission of the parts and implied (*tađmîn*) the submission of the total. In this way, Pharaoh's belief was weaker, and thus in submitting to God Bilqîs became more apposite than Pharaoh in submission.

Pharaoh was under the predication of the time, and because of that he said: 'I believe in that which the sons of Israel believe in', because that time was the time of *bani* Israel's being saved from drowning, and their victory over the Pharaoh. That is why Pharaoh related his belief and specified it, because he had seen the magicians who had said in their belief that they believed in the Lord of Moses and Aaron, thus specifying their belief. And it is because of that belief that the sons of Israel were saved from drowning, and Pharaoh knew this and that is why he said: 'I believe in what the sons of Israel believe in', and specified it to that Lord which the sons of Israel believed in and which was the Lord of Moses and Aaron. Consequently, Pharaoh specified his belief because of the specification that the magicians had brought about, thus imitating them and pleading to be saved like they were saved. Thus, when he saw that his power was defeated, and seeing the power in the sons of Israel, he inclined towards them, and in his belief he compared the specification to the specification of the magicians, and in this comparison he erred because the magicians' belief is conditioned to the belief of the prophet. It is necessary that the subject

condition his belief to that of the prophet, and the Pharaoh conditioned his belief to the belief of the sons of Israel. Consequently, after the magicians in their words had universalized by saying: 'We believe in the Lord of the universes', they specified it by saying 'Lord of Moses and Aaron'. Consequently, between the beliefs of Pharaoh and Bilqîs there is a length of unintelligence.

The submission of Solomon became the submission of Bilqîs when she said: 'I have submitted with Solomon . . .', and Bilqîs became subject to Solomon like his other friends, who never separated from their friend and agreed in everything with him like friends do, so that there is no separation in their way, and there was not a thing in belief that Solomon passed by that Bilqîs did not equally do so. In other words, Solomon did not enact one of the items of belief without Bilqîs equally enacting the same, because Solomon was the sovereign of her allegiance and a person does not subject himself to another except in subjecting himself to that person's beliefs. Moreover, like us who are on the straight path since our forelocks are in His hands and as our mutually separating from it is impossible, in the same way Bilqîs is subject to Solomon in the path of beliefs and does not separate from him. And we are with Him through implication and He is with us explicitly since He holds us from our forelocks, because indeed God said: 'And He is with you wherever you are.' Thus we are in His retinue since He holds us by the forelock and He walks with us in His straight path. By virtue of this, He is walking with Himself and holds Himself, because that which is individuated in our identity is the Being of the *ḥaqq* and no other. And there is not one in the universe who is not on the straight path, and that path is the path of the High Lord upon which He walks and He holds us by our forelocks, and that all the universes are upon the straight path is by relationship to the Lords and by relationship to the Absolute Lord. Thus Bilqîs knew from Solomon and said: '. . . to God, the Lord of the universes', and did not specify a universe from among the universes. In other words, she knew that Solomon was by submission and implication with God and that Solomon is on the straight path with the Lord, and that the Lord is also with the totality of the things with His Names, thus Solomon is also with the totality of things because he is with God with all His Names. It is because of this that Bilqîs said: '. . . to God, the Lord of the universes', and did not specify any one universe, observing His Lordship in the totality of universes and

because she knew that with His Names He was individuated in all the universes.

On the other hand, that dominion (*taskhîr*) which was made particular for Solomon is what made Solomon superior, by virtue of that same dominion, to any other of the people of the universe, and God made this a part of his own possession so that after him it is not suitable for anybody to be manifested in the same way, and that is because that dominion made particular for Solomon is through his order, and it is positively through order and not by *himmah* or collecting of hearts, nor is it by the oppression of *wahr*. God said: 'We gave him dominion over the wind, which blows by his order', that is to say, having given dominion to Solomon over the wind, the wind would blow by Solomon's order, and this is because this dominion which is particular to Solomon is positive dominion and no other. God says concerning all of us, without specification: 'We have given you dominion over that which is in the heavens and the earth, over all of them', and in explaining this God mentioned wind and stars and other things, all of which is under our dominion, but they are not under our dominion by our order but rather under God's order, because He says: 'We gave dominion to you . . .' Thus if you understand, Solomon is not particularized from us except by order, without totality and without *himmah*; rather he is specialized positively and only for order. Thus we say that Solomon was specialized in dominion simply and positively by order and is not by *himmah* and totality specialized in dominion, because indeed we know that the bodies of the universe are activated for the purposes of *himmah* of the complete people, as the perfect beings abide in the station of totality, and in fact we have examined in this Way of God that the bodies of the universe are activated for the *himmah* of persons. From Solomon, when he wished the dominion over something, it was necessary simply to pronounce the order, without *himmah* and without totality. The totality of the universe with Divine dominion is under our dominion, and in the same way there is activation in the bodies of the universe for the perfect beings with *himmah* and totality of heart. In these two orders there is no superiority to us except that the particularization of his dominion without *himmah* and collectivity is simply by the pronouncing of an order. Oh complete gnostic, know, may God confirm and corroborate us and you from His side with spirit and assistance and guidance to success, that in fact a gift like this by way of munificence, as a gift from God bestowed upon

Solomon which is possession and dispensing, if this happens for a servant, whatever servant, whether it be Solomon or someone else, whether the servant be deserving or non-deserving, the state is this, that that gift does not become subtracted from his possession in the other world and is not accounted on him, but with all that, Solomon asked it of his Lord. However, the *dhawq* of the Way necessitates that this gift which has been hastened for Solomon is reserved for another. He is made to account for it in the other world, if he wished for it, that is to say, subtracting it from his possession in the other world he wants to use it when he wants, he is accounted with it, because each gift which arrives to a man arrives through his demanding it from God from his own *nafs*. Consequently, that person is accountable for it in the other world, but not if he demands it with the (Divine) order of God, and he is not accounted with that gift in the other world. God said to Solomon: 'This is Our gift,' but He did not say 'to you', or to another, but rather generalized it. 'Whether you keep this gift for yourself or you give it to another, it will not be reckoned in the other world against you, and be sure that there is no worry in this world or the other world for this.' We have come to know through the way of *dhawq* that Solomon asked for this gift from God through an order of his Lord, and if the demand is through a Divine order, the person who has asked for it has complete reward (remuneration) for having obeyed the order and having persevered in the demand, and the Creator, if He wishes, destines it to him in that matter wherein he made the request, or if He wishes He withholds it, because in fact the servant has obeyed the order that God made it necessary for him to obey. But if that demand is from the servant's own *nafs* without there being an order from his Lord to ask for it, certainly his Lord will account for it in the other world if the Lord bestows him that gift. Now let it be known like this, that a gift given through munificence is not subject to reckoning because it is given through the way of bounty (*imtinân*), and in a gift which is the result of a plea, if the pleading is through the Divine order, that equally is not reckoned, whether the gift has been bestowed or withheld, and that gift is not decreased from his possession in the other world. The servant is created for servanthood and remains at the level of his Lord's order, and the gift given to Solomon is of this kind. The plea through Divine order is sometimes destined and sometimes not destined, which means that its destination is retarded from the time of pleading. If the pleading is not by Divine

order and God has destined it, then surely it is reckoned in the other world and diminished from his possession therein. And this determination is fluent in all things which are demanded of God, whether the demand be through the Divine order or without that order. And the demand through the Divine order is like God said to His Prophet: 'Say: Lord, increase me in knowledge', and the Envoy obeyed the order and demanded increase in knowledge, and he used to say: 'Lord, increase me in knowledge' three times. When in his sleep milk was given to him, he used to interpret the milk as knowledge, because he demanded more of knowledge and because he knew the place where the dream occurs, since he knew that milk was interpreted with knowledge and since he knew that in the dream knowledge manifests with the image of milk because of the similarities and relationship of milk and knowledge in the education and completion of the lacking spirits and in the bodies of the lacking children. Consequently, he interpreted his dream in the same way when he was given a glass of milk. The Envoy drank it and what was left over he gave to Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭab. One of his friends in his company asked him what did he interpret the milk with, and he answered: 'With knowledge.' In the same way, on the night of the Journey when he was taken up, the Angel brought him a bowl containing milk and another bowl containing wine, and the Envoy drank the milk, and the Angel said to him: 'Oh Envoy of God, you have chosen the natural constitution just as wished for, that is to say, this religion upon which you are, or the Divine natural constitution in the Divine Knowledge; you have done just as wished, because your natural constitution requires this. May God make your people to you just as wished for, because by you hitting the mark they also hit the mark and they reach you', or it could also mean: '. . . and because of you hitting the mark God will bestow on your people doing just as wished for.' When milk appears in the dream it is the image of knowledge and it is knowledge which is symbolized by the image of milk, just as Gabriel was symbolized in the image of a young man to Mary. When the Prophet said: 'People are asleep and when they die they awake', he wanted to point out that anything that mankind sees in this world is in fact like in a state of dream for a person who is asleep, and it is an illusion (*khayâl*). In other words, he pointed at the fact that everything that Man saw in this world is like the illusion one sees in the state of dreaming, and without a doubt it is necessary to interpret what he sees. In fact, feelings and

witnessings is for somebody asleep like a dream. In other words, they are illusions and similarities like he sees in the images of his dreams, because illusion personifies the meaning and gives body and similarity to realities and spirits. In the same way, the universe of feeling, which is the natural and elemental bodies, are images of personifications and similarities for the universes of essences and *nafs* which are above it, and God manifested this as acts (*âyat*) and appointed them as examples for the images and the collectivity of eternal intellectual meanings which are the things and essential states of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, it is necessary to interpret images which are in the state of dreams. In other words, it is necessary to interpret them with the realities of the essential things and the One Being of God, and the One Being of God, by virtue of the places of manifestation, is manifest in varied opposing images, just as one meaning manifests in different images for the one who is asleep. In short, it is necessary to interpret this dream, and it is absolutely necessary for the man not to remain in the degree of illusion, to reach awareness of the reality to interpret this dream, so that he reaches the degree of true awakening at the level of death through total annihilation and complete *fanâ'*, so that he observes and does not remain veiled from observing God who is manifest in the totality of images and what is aimed at through those images.

Indeed, the immanence is illusion
 And it is the Truth in Truth,
 And those who understand this
 Have acquired the mysteries of the *ṭarîqah*.

Indeed the immanence by its forms and images and planes and its inscriptions (carvings) is an illusion which is manifested in the Being of the *ḥaqq*, yet the truth is that the immanence is in reality the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the fact that that which is manifest in these images of immanence is the Being of the One *ḥaqq*, because the Being of the One *ḥaqq*, because of the *a'yân* in the images of the receptive *a'yân*, manifests with the revelation of being, and the person who understands that the immanence is an illusion and by virtue of its reality the *ḥaqq*, and that he did not remain veiled with these images from the *ḥaqq* who is revealed in these images and differs in these images and is adorned with qualities, he has acquired the meanings of the

mysteries of the *ṭarīqah* and come to know them completely. The state of the Envoy was such that when he was offered milk he used to say: 'My God, bless for us what there is in it and increase for us from it', because indeed the Envoy used to see the milk as the image of knowledge and thereby he used to ask for the increase of knowledge, and he was indeed ordered to demand more of this knowledge when God said to him: 'And say: My Lord, increase me in knowledge.' If anything other than milk was offered to him he used to say: 'My God, bless for us what is in it and feed us in the best way from it.' What was better than that was milk, as milk is the image of knowledge. When God bestows upon someone through a demand by Divine order, indeed God will not consider reckoning in the other world with that thing because the demand was made through Divine order, but for a thing that a person demands from his own *nafs* without a Divine order and is bestowed with it, for that in fact referred to the order of God, He reckons with it if He wishes and does not do so if He wishes. And I plead for knowledge specially from God, because if a person demands knowledge from his own self and if God gave him that knowledge, God does not reckon with that, because God's order to His Prophet to demand more of knowledge is the same as the order to his people. In other words, the order to the Prophet is the order to his people, because God says: 'For you there is in the Envoy the best and the most beautiful example (model, pattern)', and which example is greater than this mutually comforting of intellect from God for one? In other words, what can there be better for a person whose understanding is from God, that is, God makes him understand? In the demand for the increase of knowledge the order to the Envoy is equally order to us because we are included in the being of the Envoy. It may be that in relation to us the Envoy is sometimes ordered in certain orders, but the state is that his degree is very much higher than that. If we had made you aware of the complete station of Solomon, indeed you would have seen an order to rise to the understanding of which would have given you terror. In fact, most of the gnostics of this *ṭarīqah* were ignorant of the state and the place of Solomon, but the state is that the order is not like what they think. Some thought that Solomon put his name above that of God and chose the possessors of this world and asked of God that this possession be never given to another, and that the possession he was given in this world will be diminished from his possession in the other world, but the state is that Solomon's degree in the sight

of God is far grander than their words concerning him, because Solomon was realized in the totality and perfection in the degree of viceregency, and God was revealed and manifest according to the image of the perfection of the Compassionate Beatitude and in the perfection of the degree of viceregency in the place of manifestation of Solomon. He was of the most perfect of Divine polish (mirrored surfaces), yet with all that, he stood with the perfection of servanthood to God. Solomon, while he was in the vision of witnessing of his Lord according to this perfection and was in the 'ayn of manifestation with all the greatest of Names, worked with his hands and ate from what he earned, and kept company of the poor and needy and found pride with their converse, and used to say: 'The needy keep company with the needy.' The value and power of Solomon is not like what the ignorants of this *ṭarīqah*'s gnostics think. That which God values is the real value.



The Wisdom of Being (*al-hikmat al-wujûdiyyah*) in the Word of David

THE aspect of attributing the Wisdom of the Word of Being to the Word of David was explained in the index, and concerning the attribution of the Wisdom of Being to the Davidian Word is in the same way explained by the Shaykh (R.A.), who points at the fact that the completion and perfection of Being, and the Being of completion and perfection, happens through it being manifested from the Presence of *jawâd* and *wahhâb* together with the Divine total worldly viceregency in the human collectivity of collectivity of the singularity. Even though this completion of Being manifests in all the prophets and saints who are manifested Viceregents in every age, its most complete and clear manifestation is in the case of David, because God the High has collected between the two caliphates for David, that is to say, between the Divine spiritual reality of caliphate and the apparent caliphate of possession and kingdom which is apparent in this world as the caliphate with the sword and total judgement. He also gave him prophethood and determination and extension of address and total possession and penetrating judgement, which latter appertains also to the totality of kinds and genres of the universe. This same judgement manifests in Solomon in perfection, and Solomon is one of the beauties of the beauty of David because he is a gift to David. 'And We have given as gift Solomon to David' (Quran); consequently he attests to the completion and perfection of David and it is a munificence for his superiority. And that this aspect did not manifest in any other perfect ones of Viceregents is due to the fact of God the High specializing this to David as a specialty of total completions of David (S.A.). The fact that God the High said: 'Oh David, We have brought you as Vice-regent upon the earth, and judge among the people with truth', He verifies with certainty his viceregency and its specialization to him, as such certainty of announcement has not happened to anyone other than David. The fact that God the High has said: 'I will bring upon the earth a Viceregent', the viceregency is probable for Adam, because

Adam is the first Viceregent, and is recurrent among the perfect ones of his progeniture, but from all close indications it is possibly preferable to attribute this for David. Because Adam (S.A.) did not cause effusion of blood as understood from the answer of the angels to what God had said: 'Will You bring therein, then, one who will cause mischief and effusion of blood?' Consequently, it is preferable to consider the arguing of the angels more probable to be referring to David, who effused a lot of blood from among the enemies of God, and he killed Goliath and destroyed his realm. Furthermore, relating the story of the Queen of Sheba (Bilqîs), who says: 'Indeed, when kings enter a country they destroy it, and make its highest people the lowest', thus God the High ordered David the destruction of the states and realms of the people who would not submit to David, and other powerful viceregents from among the coverers-up of Truth who manifested from time to time. This destruction is a relative destruction which in reality is the purification of religion and the realm. In any case, the words of the angels became true where it concerns David. In short, there was not left a single degree from among the degrees of being in which the completion and the viceregency of David did not manifest. You, know it like this, that in fact when prophethood and envoyship have become Divine specialty, there is nothing in it of gaining (of degrees and such), that is to say, in the prophethood of law-giving. That the gifts of the High One are gifts of this sort for them, with nothing in return, and He does not ask of them their desert, and He gives it as a gift to them in the way of munificence and superiority, which means that there is nothing acquired through actions and devotions and prayers in the gaining of prophethood, that is to say, in the prophethood which establishes new laws, and it is not a gift in recompense for deeds. The gifts that God the High gives to the prophets (S.A.) are of this sort, which means that they are gifts of Divine specialty, and these gifts do not require anything in return, nor is anything in return expected of them. Thus, these gifts that God gives them is through His own Munificence and in view of making them superior. In other words, prophethood and envoyship are of Divine specialty and of eternal unknowable guidance and assistance (*tawfîq*). Thus, prophethood and envoyship cannot be gained. It is only possible through a gift through God. Some philosophers think that envoyship and prophethood is a result for someone who perfects himself in acts and knowledge, and that prophethood is nothing other than knowledge and action, and that everyone whose knowledge and

action is perfect is a prophet, but this is wrong. Were it true it would necessitate Divine inspiration (*wahy*) and the descending of an angel with laws of religion. However, this order is not like that. It is evident that prophethood and envoyship is a Divine specialty and does not result from knowledge and action, and its realization does not depend upon the realization of what necessitates it, because the existence of what is necessary and its realization is by the existence of what is needed, and it cannot be any other way. In the same way, other gifts which have been given to the prophets are equally Divine gifts and Divine benefits with nothing expected in return and only through munificence and way of superiority. Consequently, as prophethood is of Divine specialty, God did not ask in return for it thanks or desert from the prophets. Nevertheless, thanks always emanates from them and they act with pure acts, but there is no demand of thanks in return for the specialty from God, and of the prophets a return is not expected. And He said: 'We gave him as gift Isaac and Jacob', that is to say, to Abraham, the *khalîl* (S.A.) (the intimate Friend), and He said of Job: 'We gave him as gift his wife and others with it', and He said in the case of Moses (S.A.): 'We gave him as a gift from Our Compassion and Mercy his brother Aaron as a prophet', and other examples like this. And that which protects them first is that which also protects them to the end in all their states, or in most of them, and this is no other than His Name the *wahhâb*. And He said in the case of David: 'And when We in fact gave David from Our Munificence.' He did not condition it with the request of desert from him and He did not give news of this gift to him for which He mentioned a desert. In fact God the High did not conjoin to the gift He gave David a desert, that is to say, a knowledge, so that He should ask of David something in return, and when God gave David news of this gift He did not tell David that this was in return for an action, or a desert. On the contrary, He rather mentioned that this was given to David as a gift from His Munificence. And again, when He says: 'We have given Solomon to David as a gift', it is again definitely a free gift and a gift of munificence. And this sort of gift is a gift of kindness and a superiority. In such cases there is no determination of desert.

And He did not require from him thanks for this action. He required it from the people of David. He did not omit to hint with the mention of David, so that they (the people of David) might thank Him for what He gave to David as beneficence. Thus He did not ask the thanks from

David because He gave all as gift of superiority and kindness to David, and that great gift and munificence was inherited by the people of David and that they should give thanks to Him in return for His munificence. And that is in the case of David a gift of munificence and of kindness and superiority. In the case of his people it is different to this by the request of a replacement, and the High said: 'And the people of David did give thanks, and only a few of My servants give thanks in abundance.' And indeed when the prophets (S.A.) gave thanks to God for what He gave them as a present and as munificence, this was not from God a request. It was done through their own selves gratuitously, just as when the Envoy (S.A.) stood up until his legs became ill, in thanks when God covered up all that was of his sins in the past and in the future, and when it was said to him in this matter, he (the Prophet) said: 'Should I not be of the servants who give great thanks?', or when He said of Noah: 'He was a servant who gave great thanks', but from among the servants of God those who give great thanks are a few. Thus, God did not demand a return act from David but did so from his people. It is true that the prophets gave great thanks to God the High for what He gave them as munificence and gift without asking anything in return, and what they had received from God did not happen because they gave Him great thanks. Rather that they gave their thanks from themselves gratuitously, such as when the Envoy (S.A.) stood up all night until his legs swelled up because God had said to him that He had covered up all his sins of the past and future. And when they said to the Prophet (S.A.) concerning his standing up all night: 'God has forgiven you all your sins of the past and future, so why do you stand up and tire yourself and punish yourself like this?', he answered them: 'Should I not be a servant that gives great thanks?' In other words, he meant: I give great thanks to Him whether it be necessarily so or supererogatory, whether it be for the munificence or without the munificence, for what necessarily befalls me or what does not necessarily befall me.

Where God mentions the fact that only a few of His servants are greatly thankful, He mentions the word 'thanks' in the superlative case so that it refers generally to the thanks by necessity and gratuitous thanks. The gratuitous thanks is like the case of the Prophet when he said: 'Shall I not be a servant that gives great thanks?', and the thanks of obligation is like when God says: 'And give thanks to God and give great thanks to the Munificence of God', which happens to be an order. The difference between these two kinds of thanks is

that one is not in return for a request, whereas the other is the contrary. It is a definite order and a request for thanks. In the second case this is so because it is not that the Divine gifts came to him by way of kindness and superiority, nor does his thanks change over from thanking by order to thanking gratuitously. Between these two categories, the one who thanks gratuitously is superior and more perfect than the one who gives thanks by necessity. And the first munificence that God gave as munificence to David was to give him the gift of a name in which there is no letter from among the letters of connection, and He cut him off by this from the universe and through this name He let us know positively, and those letters are the letter *dāl* and the letter *alif* and the letter *waw*. These letters cannot be joined to letters that follow it. Thus the mysteries of the cutting away of David from the universe is manifested in the letters of his name. And He called Mohammed with the letters that connect and separate, and He connected and separated from the universe and collected between the two states in his name, just as He collected David between two states in the way of meaning. Thus, He connected him to His Ipseity and separated him from the universe. Thus the High God united between the two states in his name, joining him to the *ḥaqq* and separating him from the universe, which He had done for David only in the way of meaning, joining between the two states, which means, from the aspect of meaning and degree He cut him off from the universe and joined him to Himself. And He did not do this in his (David's) name. In David's name He did not collect the letters of connection and separating except through the aspect of meaning. And He made this a specialty for Mohammed over David, I mean, to draw his (Mohammed's) attention to the fact that with his name the order became complete from all aspects, and it is in the same way for his name Ahmed. Thus, to collect in the name between connection and separation was specialized for Mohammed over David, which means that his attention was drawn to the fact that by his name the two states were collected together. Consequently, in the case of Mohammed the order was completed in all its aspects, that is to say, from the aspect of his name and meaning and the aspect of his reality so that it became general, and that is why also in the name Ahmed of Mohammed the collection between the two states was brought about, because in the name Ahmed the letters of separation, which is the letter *dāl*, and the letters of connection, which are the *ḥa* and the *mîm*, are collected together. And this is from the Wisdom of God. It is a Divine Wisdom to

give names in the way mentioned or draw attention in both these names, and they denote each one's degree and essence and what they are named. Then He said in the case of David (S.A.) that He bestowed upon him by way of munificence to him the loudly repeating of the mountains with him, and praise. Thus, God says concerning this gift that He gave to David: 'We subjected the mountains to him with him, and they gave praise at night and at dawn, and the birds collected all to him from all sides.' And they praised with his (David's) praise so that their acts be for him, and the birds in the same way. Thus the mountains praised with the praising of David, that is to say, in whichever way David praised God and repeated his praise and raised his voice, the mountains equally echoed his voice and praised due to their agreement with David, so that the action of the mountains referred back to David, and the superiority of the action was given back to him so that he was twice recompensed for his action, once in return for his praise and a second time for what of his voice was returned to him. Thus, that David (S.A.) could determine and dispense in all the universe is shown by this submission and agreement of these two kinds. These two kinds are the most strongly recalcitrant to acceptance and reasoning towards the humans from among all kinds of things of the immanence, because in one of these two kinds there is a heaviness which is dominant, and in the other a lightness, and it is a fact that heaviness and lightness each prohibit receptivity and dispensing and submission and agreement. The mountains, due to their weight, are heavy against receptivity, and the birds equally, due to their lightness, are excessive in lack of stability between the hands of the actor, thus making it difficult to feel receptive or effect. Thus each of these kinds known to be beyond receptivity and concordance, nevertheless their concordance and submission to David is to prove that the humankind, who is the closest to the limits of equilibrium, is necessarily the beginning and the end of agreement and concordance. This is the tongue of the manifest. However, the tongue of allusion points at this, that the mountains are images of stability, establishment and staying, which is particular to the manifest aspect of the people of completion. The bird on the other hand is the image of the powers of reality and spirituality in the emergence of the Perfect Man. Thus, when David (S.A.) with complete devotion and renouncement turned to God the High with essential love and strength of eagerness and yearning and loving adoration, and when he made the Person of the Dear and Powerful Lord

effective over himself and all that belonged to him, all his bodily and spiritual powers being subject in the manifest and the interior to Him, and as the praises and the repetitions of praise were under the determination and dispensation of the heart of David, God the High manifested, bringing as an example the repetition of praise of the mountains and the birds allocated to David's praise, thus He manifested the mystery of the fact that David's exterior and interior was in conformity with Himself. This was because at the time of David the revelation of the manifest was predominant, because there had remained at the time of David some of the determination of the Mosaic invitation which happened to be under the Name Manifest. And He bestowed upon him strength and munificence by it. And God the High qualified David with strength in different quotes from the Quran, like in the case of the iron, and others. And He bestowed on him wisdom, that is to say, both in the apparent matters of politics, government, and in the interior, by bestowing upon him the knowledge of the Divine realities, the degrees of Names and immanences. And after that the greatest favour and the rank of the very proximity to God which God made special for him, the definite assertion concerning his caliphate, the like of which He did not do for any one of his kind and there were caliphs from among them, and He said: 'Oh David, We have brought you as Caliph upon the earth. Judge among the people in truth and do not follow passion', do not let any other thing come into your mind in your judgements other than the inspiration from Me, 'which will deviate you from the Way of God', that is to say, from the Way with which the envoys have been inspired, which means that after this the greatest favour is from David to God, and the rank of the very proximity to God results for David from God, which rank God has specialized for David, and this is certifying the viceregency of David which He did not do for any one of the prophets who are members of David's kind. Even though there were Viceregents from the same kind of people as David, He had not specialized them like this. In other words, He said: 'Oh David, in fact We have made you Viceregent in earth, thus judge and give justice with truth among people and do not follow other passion, in other words do not follow anything that comes into your mind other than what I have inspired you with in judgement, as those things could deviate you from the Way of God, that is to say, from the Way with which I have inspired My envoys.' Then He who is praised showed good form where it concerned David, and said: 'In fact those who

deviate from the Way of God, for them there is a strong punishment due to the fact that they have forgotten the Day of Reckoning', but He did not say to him: 'If you deviate from My Way, for you there is strong punishment.' That means that He did not say to David: 'If you turn away from My Way there will be great punishment for you', even though as seen from the words the intention was David, but as David was individuated in the degree of viceregency He absolved from him the possibility of his falling into deviation, and He observed with David the rule of respect and conformed to it, and He turned to the courtesy of changing the grammatical structure from the personal to the impersonal. Thus God the High conformed to the rule of good form with His Viceregents. And where are you, Oh miserable, where it concerns conformity to the good form concerning the Viceregents of God? And if you would say there is also certainty in the viceregency of Adam, we will say that certainty is not the same certainty as in the case of David, and when He said to the angels: 'I will bring a Viceregent upon the earth', He did not say: 'I am bringing Adam Viceregent upon earth', and He did not say in that similarly concerning David where He said: 'We shall bring you as Viceregent', in that this one is definitely certain and the other is not like this. This is to say, even if God had said: 'In fact I make Adam My Viceregent on earth', it would not have been the same as when He said: 'We shall bring you as Viceregent.' First of all, the grammatical form used in the case of Adam as told the angels, is not a verification of a fact done, as it denotes a case for the present and the future, whereas in the case of David it is with the past case, and in the phrase used: 'And thus We have brought you' is a face to face address to David, whereas 'I shall bring' is according to an indefinite form. And the mention of Adam in the episode does not denote after all this that he was the same as that Viceregent for whom there was a certain decision of God concerning him. Thus, there is no certainty of decision concerning the viceregency of Adam as there is in the case of David. Be solicitous of the informations that God gives concerning His servants when He informs, which means, thus you keep your heart ready to collect Divine information when God informs of His servants, and view it with serenity of heart. And in the same way, in the case of Abraham, the *khalîl*, He said: 'I shall bring you as Leader (*imâm*) among people', but He did not say 'Viceregent', and indeed we know that leadership (*imâmah*) is viceregency, nevertheless it is not the same thing in that He did not mention him with the most intimate and specific of His Names

which is Viceregency. Thus equally in the case of Abraham it is not the clear certainty specifically mentioning the viceregency. And then, whereas viceregency is specifically mentioned for David, He brought him as a Viceregent in judgement, and this cannot be except from God, which means that viceregency in judgement cannot be except by appointment as successor from God. In other words, judgement would not be relying upon the Presence of the Name which appertains to all the Names, and that Name is the Name God, because judgement is a specification for God the High. Leadership in comparison with viceregency is like sainthood compared to prophethood. In fact each saint is not a prophet, and in the same way each leader is not a Viceregent, whereas each Viceregent is a leader just as each prophet is a saint. It also happens that at times the Viceregent is a Viceregent to another person. Thus people in general are not always Viceregents by Divine determination, whereas David was Viceregent by Divine determination. In certain copies the following occurs: 'It would not be the same even if He had mentioned', which would mean that the viceregency of Abraham is not the same as the viceregency of David even if God had mentioned the viceregency with His specific Name which is Viceregency. That is to say, if God had said: 'I will bring you as Viceregent over the people', thus mentioning the word Viceregent for Abraham with the Name Viceregent, again it would not be the same thing, because the viceregency of David is ascertained. He said to him: 'Judge among the people with truth', and the viceregency of Adam could not have been of this degree. His (Adam's) viceregency might be succession to viceregency of what there was before in this matter, not that he was appointed by God over the creation by Divine determination, and even if the order happened to be like this, yet our words are only concerned with the matter of absolute support concerning him and a direct mention of it. Thus God the High said to David: 'Judge among the people with truth' and specifically appoints David as Viceregent in justice and truth to judge over the people. Adam's viceregency does not come under the same category. It could be that Adam's viceregency was in succession to what there was of degree of viceregency before him. One could conjecture, that is to say, that Adam's viceregency might be a viceregency to whatever there was before him as Viceregent from among the angels or other creatures, but it is not like in the case of David, that Adam was appointed by God to judge and determine among the people and over the people by Divine determination.

However, even if it were like that, that is, even if Adam was a Vice-regent upon earth and was appointed, yet this is not what we are talking about. What we say is absolute support concerning him and a direct mention of it. In other words, God the High made David's viceregency with absolute support, which He did not do in the case of anyone else of his kind. Our intention in this matter is the absolute support in the case of David and the absolute support with direct mention, and nothing else. And God has Viceregents to God upon earth and they are envoys, but the viceregency today is from the Envoy, not from God, and they determine or judge only according to what the Envoy gave them as law, and they do not go beyond that. However, the situation is like this, that there exist upon earth Viceregents from God and they are in manifestation Viceregents who are envoys and gnostics who submit to the Envoy (S.A.), who know the Divine laws and determinations, like the eminent leaders who have ingeniously solved difficult questions under canon law, and in the interior the regents who are the complete ones from among the saints and Poles (*aqtâb*). However, today viceregency is only from the Envoy and not from God without the intermediary of the Envoy, because today the Viceregents do not determine or judge except through the judgement which the Envoy has put forth for them as canon, and they do not go beyond that determination and they do not judge beyond that with another determination. Thus these are equally individuated Viceregents in manifestation and they are the Viceregents of the Envoy. There is another matter of delicacy in this, in fact, not known to anyone except the ones like us, and that is in taking what they judge by from the canon of the Envoy (S.A.), and that the Viceregents of the Envoy who take the judgement and the determination by being transferred to them from the S.A. and through the ingenious solving of problems, the origin of which is equally transferred to them from the S.A., and there are also from among us who take it from God and who are Viceregents from God in exactly that determination. For them there happens to be a special point of consideration due to the fact that it was the same special point of consideration in the case of the Envoy (S.A.), and these in appearance are subject due to the fact that they are not in opposition or difference in determination (to the Envoy), like Jesus (S.A.) when he descends and determines and judges, and like the Prophet Mohammed (S.A.) in His words: 'There are those whom God has guided, so follow what they have been guided in.' There is a matter which in fact nobody other than the ones like us know. Today

the viceregency happens from the Envoy in the taking of that determination with which the Viceregents determine from that very same determination which was made legal to the Envoy (S.A.). Thus the Viceregent to the Envoy is such a person whose determination is transferred to him by the Envoy (S.A.) and from where he takes it. That is to say, either by the Envoy (S.A.) transferring it to him, or takes it through a transference and information arriving to him from the Envoy, or he takes it through exertion of his utmost acumen to form a correct legal opinion, the origin of which is again taken from what is transferred from the S.A. Thus the manifest Viceregents do not go beyond the law that the Envoy (S.A.) has set. However, among us there are certain Viceregents who take that determination from God, that same determination that the Envoy (S.A.) has taken from God in manifestation and made it legal to his heirs and who have taken it from the S.A. Thus, he who takes it without intermediary from God becomes the Viceregent of God in that in the essence of that determination, that is to say, by taking that determination exactly from God which the Envoy (S.A.) had equally taken from God and made it legal to his followers. Thus, for that Viceregent there happens to come about a special point of consideration exactly as there has come about a special point of consideration for the Envoy (S.A.) of God. That is to say, just as the Envoy (S.A.) took it from God he also takes it from God, and the place of taking of that determination is equally God to both of them. That Viceregent is subject to the Envoy (S.A.) in the open in that he has no opposition or differentiation from the Envoy (S.A.), and equally like the Prophet who is the Mohammed (S.A.) to whom God said: 'There are those whom God has guided, so follow them in their guidance', that is to say, like the Envoy (S.A.) follows the guidance of the former envoys and prophets (S.A.). This means that the Envoy (S.A.) was ordered to follow the guidance with which the former envoys and prophets were guided. The Envoy (S.A.) was not ordered to follow them, but was ordered to follow that with which they were guided. Consequently, he takes it from God just as they took from God. **And he in truth is specialized for that which he knows from that way of taking, and he is concordant**, which means, even though the Viceregent who takes it directly from God is in appearance subject to the Envoy in determination, yet that Viceregent is specifically adopted for that which he knows from that way of taking, and in this he is not subject, yet in taking it he is concordant to the Prophet because he has

no difference of opinion to that of the Envoy. In other words, by Divine appointment he is adopted for taking from God specifically that determination, and he takes it from God and he is concordant with the taking of the Prophet and to his (the Envoy's) order in appearance. And he is therein at the position that the Prophet (S.A.) affirmed from the law of the envoys which came before him and affirmed in their time, and we submit to it due to his (the Prophet's S.A.) affirmation, not due to the fact that it was a law of someone else before him. The Viceregent who is in concordance with the Envoy and who is specified to receive from God is at the same position, where it concerns the confirmation of that determination, as the Prophet (S.A.), who confirmed it from the law of an envoy that preceded him, since the Envoy (S.A.) confirmed that determination for us in his own law. Thus we submit to that determination by virtue of the fact that the Envoy (S.A.) has confirmed, that is to say, by virtue of the fact that the Envoy (S.A.) has confirmed it for us in his own law, but we did not submit to it by virtue of the fact that it was a determination from an envoy other than the Envoy (S.A.). And in this way, when the Viceregent takes from God it is from the same place that he takes as the Envoy has taken. The way that the Viceregent has taken from God a certain determination, which is the same determination as the Envoy (S.A.) has taken it from God, is in this way. Thus the Viceregent is independent in taking that determination from God, and as that determination taken is conformed to the Envoy in appearance it is in appearance conformed to his determination. And we say in this matter with the tongue of insight (*kashf*) 'the Viceregent of God', and with the tongue of the apparent 'the Viceregent of the Envoy of God'. And there is also this, that when the Envoy of God died he did not put a definite degree or condition to viceregency from his Lord, and there were Viceregents from God the High in concordance with the determinations of the law, and as the S.A. knew this he did not restrict the order. Thus, with the tongue of insight we say concerning a Viceregent that he is a Viceregent of God and he takes it in reality directly from God, but with the tongue of appearance we say he is the Viceregent of the Envoy of God because in the manifest he is in conformity with him and submits to him. As there are some of us who are Viceregents of God, when the Envoy (S.A.) died he did not restrict any one person to viceregency, nor did he appoint anyone, because the Envoy (S.A.) knew that in fact among his people there are certain people who take their viceregency from their Lord. These are Viceregents of God

the High, though in that legal determination they are established in conformity with the Envoy. Consequently, when the Envoy (S.A.) knew this order he did not restrict the order of viceregency. That is to say, he did not prevent the viceregency from God and did not restrict viceregency from his own viceregency. Rather perhaps that he pointed at the Divine viceregency. **There are Viceregents of God among His people who take from the mine of the Envoy and envoys, who have taken it from where the Envoy (S.A.) has taken, and they know the superiority of that which has preceded them there.** Among His creatures there are Viceregents for God who have taken the determination and knowledge from the same ore as the Envoy and the envoys have taken, and they know the superiority of the envoy who has had precedence in that taking, because the Viceregents reach the thing they have reached because of the envoy though they take from the same ore as he has taken. However, there results a superiority for the envoy over them. **Because the envoy can receive more, and this Viceregent cannot receive more. Had he been an envoy he could have received (more),** which means that if the Viceregent, who cannot receive more, had been an envoy, he would have been able to receive more. (God) **does not give of knowledge and determination except that which is specifically in the law of the envoy to which he is in the apparent subject and not opposed. This is in opposition to (the way of) envoys.** Which means that that Vice-regent is in appearance concordant and subject to the envoy and he is not in opposition. An envoy is different because God the High has made legal certain determinations for each one of the envoys, some of which determinations are concordant with the law of a preceding envoy, and some of these determinations are not concordant by increasing or adding another determination. Thus, an envoy is capable of more where a Viceregent is not capable of more. **Do you not see Jesus (S.A.), when the Jews imagined that he would not increase over Moses, the same as we have said concerning today's viceregency with the Envoy, they believed him and they confirmed him, but when he increased a determination or when he abolished a determination which Moses had confirmed, as Jesus was an envoy, they did not believe this because it was contrary to their beliefs in this matter, and the Jews were ignorant in this order as it was and they demanded his death. Thus, when Jesus concorded with what Moses had given as law, as the Viceregent is subject to the Envoy like we said, in the appearance he was not apparent with a determination which was in opposition to Moses, and they believed in**

Jesus, and they even confirmed his prophethood because there were many more other prophets within the law of Moses. They thought Jesus was one of them, but when Jesus increased a determination of Moses or abolished a determination of Moses which Moses had confirmed in his own law, and this Jesus could do because he was an envoy himself and an envoy is able and receptive for more, the Jews could not bear the fact that Jesus increased some of Moses' determinations. In accordance with their belief the Jews found Jesus to be in opposition to what had been set by Moses in appearance. They (the Jews) had thought Jesus to be subject to Moses, and they believed in him as long as it concurred with the law of Moses. Here the Jews were completely ignorant of the thing as it was. They did not know that Jesus was an envoy and that an envoy confirms some of the determinations of the envoy that precedes him and abolishes some of them. Thus, when Jesus confirmed some of the determinations of Moses, the Jews, being ignorant of the order, thought that Jesus was subject to the law of Moses. They did not know that when Jesus confirmed some of those determinations he had confirmed them due to the fact that it was made legal for him, not because of the fact that they were the laws of Moses. Thus they demanded the death of Jesus. From this anecdote that God the High has informed us in His mighty Book concerning him and them. When he became an envoy he accepted the increasing either by diminishing the determination or by increasing it. In fact, decreasing is without a doubt increasing a determination. Thus, when Jesus became an envoy he accepted the increasing either by diminishing the determination which was confirmed or by increasing a determination, because decreasing is without a doubt due to the excess of the determination because it means mentioning with that which is not in excess. Consequently, not to mention a determination which already exists in one law in another law and not to decrease it is to increase a determination over and above the original law. As to the viceregency of today, it has not this same origin (base), and when it increases or decreases over the law it is that which is decided by a personal new legal opinion (*ijtihad*), and it is not over what was actually spoken by Mohammed (S.A.). It manifests from a Viceregent that which is contrary to a *hadith* in a certain determination, and some imagine that it is due to the personal legal opinion, but it is not like this. It could be that this information from the Prophet was not established with this leader from the aspect of insight (*kashf*) and he did not establish by that determination, and if it was that the way of this was in justice from justice it is not

devoid of conjecture, and (equally) not devoid of transposition of the meaning. Things like this happen to come about from Viceregents of today, and such things will happen to come about from Jesus (S.A.) when he comes down, and he will remove many things of the legality of a personal opinion that was decided upon, and by this removal he will make evident the real image of the true legality upon which truth was the Envoy (S.A.) and the law, especially when the determinations of the leaders were mutually opposed in one descent. It becomes clearly known that if that inspiration had come down it would have come down by one of the aspects, and that aspect would have been the Divine determination. Other than this, if God confirmed this it is due to the personal beliefs of the leaders, and that law is the law of confirmation and not the law which came down by Divine inspiration, only to remove a difficulty from this people and give amplitude in this determination among these people. The viceregency which is singularized from envoyship and prophethood which is the viceregency of today, this is not of established origin so that he may increase or decrease over the law of the Envoy (S.A.). Perhaps rather the Viceregent decreases or increases a determination over the law of the Envoy because the leaders have confirmed in their opinion this thing and that there was a difference of opinion among the leaders in this determination, but he would not increase or decrease over a law with which Mohammed (S.A.) was addressed, and which law was definitely certified for him. Thus it may happen in appearance that a certain Viceregent manifests with opposition to a certain *ḥadīth*. Then it is imagined, that is to say, a person who is veiled imagines that that opposing determination is of the opinion of the Viceregent, but it is not of the opinion of the Viceregent. Rather that at the level of this leader this news was established from the Prophet (S.A.) through insight (*kashf*). That is why he stopped in determining with that *ḥadīth*. If that *ḥadīth* had been established at his level through insight, then certainly he would have determined by it. And if the way concerning that *ḥadīth* was that of justice, then it is from justice, that is to say that in appearance it is through the way of justice that it is established, and those who retell it were from just to just until it reached the Envoy (S.A.). However, that justice is not free of conjecture and it is not free of transposing into meaning because it might transpose it into a meaning which is not the intention of the meaning meant by a commentator. Thus, things like this happen from Viceregents today. And this will happen from Jesus (S.A.), because in

fact Jesus (S.A.), in the second emergence of Man when he descends, will remove a lot of the determinations from the law confirmed by opinion. Thus Jesus (S.A.), by removing many of the determinations, clarifies the image of that true legality upon which truth was the Envoy (S.A.), especially where the determinations of the leaders created opposition in one descent. Thus it becomes absolutely certain that if it were an inspiration that descended, it would have descended according to one aspect from among the many aspects (that caused the mutual opposition of the leaders). Thus that aspect would have been the Divine determination. Other than this way, if Truth confirmed it by virtue of the opinion of the leaders, that is only a law of confirmation and is not the law which arrives through Divine inspiration, and it is to remove the difficulty from this people and is confirmed to give amplitude to determination among these people. Like God said: 'God wishes for you ease and does not wish for you difficulty.' Thus Jesus (S.A.) does not remove the determinations that the Envoy (S.A.) posed with certitude. Rather, he removes determinations of opinion for which there has been opposition among the leaders, and he will determine with that law upon which was the Envoy (S.A.), and confirmed it and which is the same order which is with God. This is the state of the Viceregent today. As to his (S.A.) words: 'If allegiance is paid to two Viceregents, kill the latter', and in this saying the latter one concerns the apparent viceregency, which is that of the sword, and even if they do agree, without a doubt one should be executed, this being different to the spiritual viceregency wherein indeed there is no execution, and if this matter of execution is brought in it is for the apparent viceregency and of course there is not for this Viceregent that station, and he is the Viceregent of the Envoy of God, and if he is just, it is because he determines according to the original (determination). It is that one may imagine the existence of two divinities, 'And if there were among them another divinity than God, there would be corruption' (Quran). These words are an answer to a possible objection, that is to say, how could your words be true when you say there are among the Viceregents of God among the people who take from the same ore as the Envoy, whereas the Envoy (S.A.) says: 'If allegiance is paid to two Viceregents, kill the latter one of them'? The Shaykh (R.A.) says in answer: The Envoy's words: '... kill the latter of them' concerns the apparent Viceregent, which is the Viceregent that wields the sword, and in fact if the two Viceregents agree in the judgements, certainly it is necessary to execute one of

them. That there is no killing in the spiritual viceregency is because the real and spiritual viceregency does not happen in every century except by one man who is the Perfect One of that age and who is the Pole, and the other Viceregents are under his determination and his dispensation. And if in fact execution came about in the apparent viceregency it is because for the one who is individuated in the apparent viceregency this station does not exist. That is to say, as there is not the station of the spiritual viceregency he does not take from God and he cannot be the Viceregent of God, whereas that Viceregent is the Envoy of God (S.A.), and if he is just in accordance with that, then in the sentence: ' . . . and there is not that station for that Viceregent' it means the one who is individuated in the apparent viceregency, and they would be the two Viceregents who are manifested with justice, in other words, for each one of the Viceregents who are individuated in the apparent viceregency who therefore do not have the degree of the Divine spiritual viceregency, yet each one of them is just, they are Viceregents of the Envoy and they are named as Viceregents. Thus, the execution of the second of the Viceregents is necessitated from that original determination whereby it becomes possible to imagine the existence of the Divinity, because God the High says: 'And if there were among them another divinity than God, there would be corruption', because the Viceregent is the place of manifestation of the degree of Divinity and the degree of Divinity is one degree and God is the One Divinity. Thus, in the being of the second Viceregents there is a possibility of imagining the existence of two divinities. Grammatically, the phrase: ' . . . it is because he determines according to the original (determination)' is an assignment of cause for the phrase: 'and if this matter of execution is brought', and it is not grammatical conjunctive to a consequence to a foregoing clause. The conjunctive to the *amma* is the phrase: ' . . . this is in the manifest viceregency.' Even if they agree (that is, if the two divinities agree), and we know that if they disagreed in evaluation, the determination of one of them would be carried out, which means that if the two divinities are concordant in determination in the apparent, yet they would differ in evaluation, thus we know that in fact the two divinities are virtually different, then certainly the determination of one of them will be carried out. And the one who carries out the determination, he is the only one according to the reality, and the one whose determination is not carried out, he is not significant. And from here we know that all

determination that is brought into execution today in the universe, it is God's determination. Even if it differs from the agreed determination in the manifest, called the legal, no other than God's determination in the order itself is carried out, because the order that there is in the universe is that it is according to the determination of the Divine procedure (*mashî'a*), not according to the determination of the agreed law. Thus, of the two divinities, the one whose determination is carried out is according to the reality and is in reality the divinity, and that divinity whose determination is not carried out is not a divinity. We know from this degree that the determination that is carried out in this universe today is in reality the determination of God, because the determination of no one else but God is carried out, even if it is in appearance in disagreement with what is called the law which is agreed upon, because in the order itself the determination of no one else other than God is carried out, because the existing order in the universe is according to the determination of the procedure (*mashî'a*) of God and not according to the determination agreed upon by law. And if its affirmation (its *sharî'ah*) was from the Divine procedure (*mashî'a*), that is why is enacted specifically its affirmation only, because for the *mashî'a* there is only the affirmation, not the action that brings it about, which means, the affirmation of the law specifically becomes effective; it is because its affirmation is from the Divine procedure, which means the law became affirmed through the Divine *mashî'a*, but the general action of the affirmation due to the law was not affirmed, because for the Divine *mashî'a* in law there is nothing other than affirmation. The general action consequent to the law is not due to the *mashî'a*. In other words, the Divine *mashî'a* affirms the law but does not necessitate its general action, unless of course the Divine *mashî'a* is also concerned with the emergence of the consequent action. However, it is not concerned generally. Consequently, at the level of the affirmation of the law, pure action emerges from those who have the aptitude and who are of the intelligent people. In fact, at the level of the concern of the Divine *mashî'a*, the *a'yân* which have the aptitude and the receptivity are guided. In short, all the orders that happen to be in the universe are according to the Divine *mashî'a* whether they agree with the law or whether they do not agree with the law, and the affirmation of the law is equally an order from among all the orders of the universe. The *mashî'a* has a very great dominion. It is because of this that Abu Ṭālib al-Makkî made it the Throne of the Ipseity, because it necessitates for its

own self a determination. Outside of the *mashî'a* there is not a thing in existence, nor is there anything elevated into being. It is because of the sublime dominion of *mashî'a* over everything that Abu Ṭâlib al-Makkî has considered it as the Throne of the Ipseity, that is to say, for the Ipseity of the Divinity, not for the Ipseity of Absolute Uniqueness, because *mashî'a* necessitates for itself a determination. Thus there is nothing in existence and nothing is elevated from being outside of the Divine *mashî'a*; which means the reality of the *mashî'a* necessitates for itself a determination because *mashî'a* necessitates breath, and in fact necessitating is itself a determination for the particularization of a thing which the Divine Knowledge designates. Thus, if the Divine *mashî'a* appertains to the happening of a certain thing, that thing happens, because the Divine order, for which there is no refusal, is such an order in which the Divine *mashî'a* appertains to its taking place in existence or in non-existence. Thus, if the Divine *mashî'a* were not in conformity to the taking place of an action, and if the order was not in conformity with that action, that action would not have taken place, even though the *mashî'a* only necessitates the conformity of the order to that action, because the *mashî'a* does not necessitate the coming about of an action from the one who is ordered. It only necessitates the order for the happening of that action. In fact, if the Divine order was opposed by what is called disobedience, it is only because of the order by intermediary, not by the order of immanencing. Absolutely no one can disobey in all He does in consequence of the order of the *mashî'a*. The opposition happens only in the case of the order through an intermediary, so understand! This means that the only possible disobedience to a Divine order by what is called disobedience is no other than a Divine order by intermediary, that is to say, an order of proposition, or an order of the religious law which has come through the intermediary of the envoy. Consequently, no one has ever disobeyed an order which comes through the order of *mashî'a*. All disobedience that has come about in all the actions of God the High came about only when the order was through an intermediary, and never through the order of the Divine *mashî'a*.

Now let it be known like this, that the Divine order is according to two parts. One is the order which is through the intermediary of the prophets and saints and the leaders of legal opinion (*ijtihâd*). The other part is without an intermediary, which is the order of immanencing, which is the order of the High God for the happening of a thing

through the Divine *mashî'a*. 'If I will something, I tell it "Be" and it becomes.' Thus in the order of immanencing, opposition is impossible, whether it appertains to the bringing about of a non-existing thing, or to the non-existentialization of the thing which exists. But opposition happens to the legal order which comes through the intermediary of the envoy. That is why certain people believe in the prophets and others do not, and that is why some of the believers act according to what they have been ordered and some of them do not. However, not a single person has opposed in any action an order through the *mashî'a* of the High God, because nothing in opposition to the Divine *mashî'a* can take place. Consequently, if opposition comes about from a servant, it is due to the fact that that order is by the intermediary of the prophet. There is no opposition to an order which happens to come through the Divine *mashî'a*. Even the opposition which happens to come out in an order of proposition happens due to an order of the *mashî'a*, because in whatever aspect the Divine *mashî'a* appertains, it is in concordance with that order that a thing happens in the manifest. Thus the order of proposition is general, whether the thing that receives the order has the aptitude or whether it has not the aptitude. If the order is in concordance with the aptitude, then that thing happens, and if it is not concordant with the aptitude, then it does not happen. Order of immanencing in relation to the immanence is general, but as the aptitudes of things are varied it becomes specialized according to the receptivity of the thing. Things that are receptive of guidance become guided. Things that are receptive of deviation are deviated. Consequently, things have no opposition to the order of immanencing. All things follow it. Let it be understood like that. 'What God willed has happened, and what He did not will did not happen.' In reality the order of *mashî'a*, when it turns to the bringing about the action itself, and not to what manifests from his hands, it is not possible that it does not come about, but in this special place. Thus, in reality the order of *mashî'a* turns to the bringing about exactly what the action requires as necessitated from its being, but does not turn to a person through whose hands the action would manifest, which means that the order of *mashî'a* only determines on the becoming of the action and to manifest and bring about what is in the power of the receptive essence. To this alone it appertains, but does not determine over the manifest actor of the action in whose place of manifestation that action has taken place. Thus it is impossible that the same as the action does not take place,

but that it happens in a special place where the action manifests in his hands. Thus the order of *mashî'a* brings about the essence of that action which is in the receptivity of the receptive essence. This is why the Shaykh noted it with the words: ' . . . not to what manifests from his hands', because the order of *mashî'a*, when it turns to bringing about the essence of an action, the essence of that action becomes the essential intention and its non-happening is impossible to think of. But if the order of *mashî'a* turned to the bringing about of a certain person in whose hands the essence of the action is manifested, it sometimes happens that it is not necessary that the essence of that action be existent at the level of the bringing about of that person. Consequently, if the aptitude of the receptive essence is concordant with the order of proposition which comes about with the language of the religious law, it is called obedience, when the order of the action becomes existent through the order of immanencing, but if the aptitude of the receptive essence is not concordant with the proposed order, when the essence of the action has come into being through the order of immanencing, it is called disobedience in respect of the order of proposition and the order of the law. That is why the Shaykh (R.A.) says: **Sometimes this is called opposition to the order of God and sometimes it is called agreement and obedience to the order of God.** Thus at a certain time the action which manifests because of the order of immanencing and because of the appertenance of the order of immanencing to the Divine order, it comes out by the word of the prophet as an order of proposition. This is called opposition as the thing which has manifested appears in opposition to the Divine order which is the order of proposition, and sometimes it is called agreement and obedience to the Divine order as the essence of the action manifests in the language of the law in accordance with the Divine order, but it is never called opposition in relation to the Divine order which is the Divine *mashî'a*, because in existence not a single action emanates which is in opposition to the Divine *mashî'a*. The essence of every action comes about due to the Divine *mashî'a* which appertains because of the special aptitude of the established potential. Also it is such that the order of the *mashî'a* is aspected to the bringing about of the essence of the action and it is not aspected towards that person in whose hands that action has manifested. Consequently, there is no opposition in consideration of the order of *mashî'a*. **Language of praise (*ḥamd*) or blame is subject to it in compliance to what it might be.** Thus, the language of

praise or blame becomes subject to the action by virtue of what has come about, that is to say, in conformity to what has come about of the action in manifestation. Legally, the language of praise is subject to it and it is called obedience if it is in concordance with the order of the law which is an order through an intermediary, and in the same way if it is not in concordance with the law. Thus, the subjection of the praise or blame to the action is due to the order which is by means of the law, but by virtue of the order of *mashî'a*, in both cases the servants are obedient to God. And if the order in itself is like we have decided, then because of that, the inclination of creation is towards happiness, and further even, according to the differences of kinds of happiness, and He interpreted from this station with that the *rahmah* expanded over everything and that it precedes the Divine Anger, which means that if it is as we have said, in fact that in consideration of the order of *mashî'a* there is no opposition, then in conformity and obedience the inclination of the creation is towards happiness, and further than this even, it is according to the differences of kinds of happiness, because the essences (*a'yân*) are different in the realities. Consequently, due to the aptitudes of the potentials (essences) the happiness of the creation manifests according to differences. It is from this station that God the High interpreted that the *rahmah* extends and expands over everything and in fact *rahmah* precedes the Divine Anger. That is to say, as the creation is obedient to the order of the *mashî'a*, that the apparent action is in conformity to the order of proposition and is called obedience, or it is in opposition and it is called disobedience, He interpreted this situation with: 'My *rahmah* extends over everything and My *rahmah* precedes My Anger', because His *rahmah* extends over everything and precedes the Divine Anger which comes about in opposition to the action which is the opposition to the order of proposition, because God the High knows the totality of the universes acts according to His manner. Each one of them acts according to the order of the *mashî'a*, and *mashî'a* appertains due to knowledge, and equally, knowledge due to the known. And that which precedes is ancient. The fact is that the *rahmah* which is ancient precedes over the Anger which is accidental, because the Anger came about accidentally in response to the action which is in opposition to the order of the law. Consequently, the inclination of all is towards the *rahmah* of happiness. And if this has attached itself to it, it is because that which is later has determined over it. In this sentence there is grammatical

transposition. Consequently, if the Anger, which is late, is attached to the servant by virtue of the servant's opposition to the order of proposition, and determined over him, that which is prior determines over that, and that which is prior and more ancient is the *rahmah* which precedes everything. And *rahmah* attains him as there is no other thing which precedes it. Consequently, *rahmah* attains the servant because there is nothing other than *rahmah* which is more ancient and prior; thus it became established that the inclination of the all is towards *rahmah* because there is no person who opposes the order of the *mashî'a*. And this is the meaning of His Mercy preceded His Anger, so that it determines over that which arrives at it, because in fact it rests on a purpose and every follower is for the purpose, without a doubt of arriving at it and without a doubt of arriving at the *rahmah* and departing from Anger, and it is so that its determination is over all that arrive at it by virtue of what the state of the one who arrives bestows upon it. Thus, what we have said is the meaning of the words: 'His *rahmah* precedes His Anger', which means that God's *rahmah* preceded His Anger so that *rahmah* determines over that person who arrives at the *rahmah*, because in fact *rahmah* abides in the purpose and it is such that the totality of the creation follows the purpose, therefore without a doubt it arrives at its purpose; and that it arrives at *rahmah*, and it is equally without a doubt that it departs from Anger because *rahmah* abides at the purpose. Thus the determination becomes specialized for the *rahmah* where it concerns each person who arrives at *rahmah*, according to what each person's state bestows, which means, as those who arrive at *rahmah* are different in their states, equally *rahmah* determines over them according to the varieties of *rahmah*, as each one of them necessitates a different kind, because the state of some requires the bestowal of pleasure of *rahmah* after a repetition of Anger. Even that place called hell becomes paradise for him, and for him ease and munificence becomes the same as hell. The state of some bestows relief from Anger after the taking of vengeance. And the state of some bestows the taste of the effect of agreement and the spirit of conscience. And the state of some bestows going up to the high degrees. In fact, in all, the end of each person is *rahmah* and happiness, even though in relation to some, *rahmah* is relative.

And he who is of understanding witnesses what we have said,

**And if there is no understanding, let him take from us.
And after that there is no other way than what we have
mentioned, so rely upon it,
And be in that state like we are.
And it is from us to you what we give out to you,
And from us to you that which we have given to you as a
gift from us.**

**And he who is of understanding witnesses what we have
said,
And if there is no understanding, let him take from us.**

Thus, that person who became the possessor of understanding and vision through God observes and witnesses with witnessing and the essences what we have mentioned, which is our contention that all incline to *rahmah*. But if a person is not the possessor of vision and understanding, then let him take the understanding and the knowledge from us. The higher degree is the degree of witnessing and of the essences. The second degree is the degree of belief and imitation.

**And after that there is no other way than what we have
mentioned, so rely upon it,
And be in that state like we are.**

Thus, that which is in the order itself is nothing other than what we have mentioned. Thus, you rely on our words, and be in a state concerning that like us, that is to say, if you will rely on what we have said, and as witnessing and the essences is our state, you will also become qualified by the state of witnessing and the essences.

**And it is from us to you what we give out to you,
And from us to you that which we have given to you as a
gift from us.**

That which we have read to you and explained to you has arrived at us from God, that is to say, it is a Divine arrival, and it comes to you from us, that which we have given to you as a gift from ourselves. That is to say, due to our being the total place of manifestation and the collectivity and breadth of our heart, because of this, the Divine knowledge and the Lordly effusion descends into our hearts, and us, due to our being the depository of trust and of our viceregency, give it as a gift to you,

and we give it as gift to you the knowledge and effusion in accordance with your receptivity and aptitude. Thus nothing comes to you from the Divine knowledge except what effuses from our hearts which are the treasures of Divine knowledge.

As to the softening of the iron, it is like the softening of the hardened heart by restriction and threat, like the fire softens the iron, which means that the softening of the iron by David (S.A.) is the image of the softening of the hardened hearts which are eventually softened by restriction and threat, just like the fire softens the iron, because the hardened heart which is frightened and rendered timorous and which is affected by restriction and threat, has aptitude. Divine exhortation and determinations, spiritual dispensings, soften them. Thus the softening of the iron by David (S.A.) is the image of the power that God the High bestowed on David for the softening of the hearts of the believers who hear his words. Thus, softening of the hearts is the spirit of the softening of the iron, because in the iron there exists a tendency to soften, just as there is a receptivity to conform and to obey in the hearts of the believers. **The softening of the iron is not difficult. That which is difficult is the hearts which are harder than stone, because fire cracks them and calcines them and does not soften them.** Thus the softening of the iron is not difficult. What is difficult is the softening of the hearts which are harder and more solid than stones, because even though the fire calcines and cracks the stone, that is to say, turns them into quicklime but does not soften them. Thus the hearts of the people who are veiled is according to three parts. One part is those hearts which are softened by restriction and threat. Another kind is like stones from which burst forth rivers: 'And there are those among them from which burst forth rivers, and there are those of them who crack and water bursts forth from them.' This category of hearts is also affected by restriction and threat, and waters of knowledge of gnosis and rivers of effusion of gnoses boil out of them. The third category is the hearts who are harder than stones. This category is not affected by advice and address. Consequently, what is the state of the Complete Man with those whose hearts are harder than stones? **And He did not soften the iron for him (David) except for making protective armour consequent to bringing into his awareness from God that nothing protects a thing except with itself, and the armour protects from the spearheads and the sword and the knife and arrowhead or blade, in fact iron protects from iron.** In fact God the High did not soften the iron for

David except for making protective armour. That is to say, to protect and save people from implements of war made of iron, and because of his actions so that David makes the armour, and that is why God the High softened the iron for him because of a warning and awakening in David in consciousness that nothing can be protected, that is to say, nothing can protect itself except by itself, because in fact it is due to armour that one can protect oneself from spearheads and knife and sword and arrowheads. Thus, in the same way, you protect yourself from iron by the iron, and thus one protects oneself from God by God. **Then came the Mohammedian Way with: 'I take refuge in You from You', so understand!** Thus the Mohammedian Way brought the words of the Envoy (S.A.) which are: 'I take refuge from You with You.' Thus one is protected from God by God, just as one is protected from iron by iron. Just as one is protected from God by God by taking a thing from God as armour, Man becoming annihilated in the Being of God with His own Ipseity and Qualities, and the Being of God encompassing his outside and inside, the Divine Being protects him from God, where God says: 'In that the strength of your Lord is the most forceful strength.' Thus, being protected by iron from iron is the image of being protected from God by God, but because this order is abstruse, he (the Shaykh) ends by saying: '... so understand!' **This is the spirit of the iron, and He is the Avenger and the Merciful, and God guides to success.** Thus, that which is understood from the words: 'I take refuge in You from You', which is the Unicity of the Ipseity, which is that one is protected from God by God, is the spirit of the softening of the iron. That is to say, this is the spirit of the softening of the iron by David (S.A.), and what is meant by that is the Unicity of the Ipseity, because God is the Avenger and the Most Merciful. Thus one is protected from the Name Avenger by the Name Most Merciful. Consequently, taking refuge in God is only possible by God, and God guides to success in the mystery of this taking refuge and in this guidance to success. There is no other Lord than Him.

Of the Wisdom of the Self (or Breath)
(*al-hikmat un-nafsiyyah*)
in the Word of Jonah (Yunus)

KNOW this to be definitely like this, that the God created this emergence of the humankind according to completion, from the points of view of spirit and body and *nafs*, in His own image. That is to say, He created this according to the image of the Divine Names and Qualities of the totality of Lordship at the Presence of Divinity, so that the Qualities of completion of this totality be manifest in him. And this emergence of humanity is created in accordance with the image of the *haqq*, and nothing can begin, or have directorship over, the removal of the order concerning this emergence other than the creator of this emergence, who is the director of the removal of this order. The removal is by His own hand, since the proof of Divinity, which is the emergence of Man and his order, cannot be removed except by His hand, and God alone kills the *nafs* at the time of death. Death strikes in different ways: either by death, or by murder and demolition, and in all cases it returns to the Divine order. And the reasons why there happens to be murder and demolition is either that it is in the hands of the *haqq* and in the hands of His *qu'arah*, or by virtue of the fact that He has ordered equal treatment in the matter of religion. In other words, He is the director of the order of this emergence, by having ordered just retribution. Now if a person without the order of God desires to disarrange the order for this emergence of humanity, that is to say, without being in accordance with religious prescription, and he is directed to its destruction, without a doubt that person oppresses (*zulm*) his own *nafs*, and he transgresses against the limits that God has established in connection with that emergence, and he labours in the destruction and demolition of a person whom God has ordered to be built up.

Now you must know this, that without a doubt it is more in line with real truth and the reality to show forgiveness and pity than to obey prescription and to persevere even for God in that conformity. That is to say, it is much more preferable in truth for the servants of God to show

mercy and tenderness towards people like murderers or like the people with whom you are at war, who are the people who cover the Truth and polytheists, the killing of whom is allowed by the *sharî'ah*. Because respect for this emergence is respect for the Divine image, since manifesting and manifestation is dependent on this emergence. Indeed God began the creation of Man with both His Hands (*inna Allâhu khalaqa âdam biyadayhi*), and to work for the continuation of this emergence is the prolongation of the image of the *haqq*, and to work to bring about this order is the working to bring about the order of creation.

When David wanted to build the Holy House and built it several times, immediately he left the building site, the house would fall down. Because of this he complained to God, and God told him: 'In fact, this House of Mine will not stand up unless it is built by the hands of a person who has not shed blood.' Then David said: 'But my Lord, did not this shedding of blood happen for Your cause and was it not by Your order?' In response, it was answered: 'Indeed it was in My cause, but are not those who were killed also My servants?', and David said: 'My Lord, allow the building of Your House to be by the hands of somebody who belongs to me', and God inspired David by: 'Indeed, your son Solomon will build it.' The reason why this story was given is to show that respect for the emergence of the humankind and the establishment of it is much more necessary than its destruction under any circumstance.

Do you not see how God ordered especial taxation and peace over the enemies of the religion, preferring their being 'allowed to live? And He said: '*Wa in janahû lissalimi fâjnaḥ laha wa tawakkal 'ala Allâh.*' 'If the polytheists incline towards you, incline towards them, indeed, and put your trust in God.' Which means that if the polytheists incline towards you and wish to make peace with you, you also definitely incline towards peace with them, and give them what they want of you, and give them what they demand of you and trust in God. Take for example that person for whom death was prescribed in retribution; but equally it is allowed in religion that the man who was demanding the blood of this man may forgive him and take money instead; or just to forgive, and the man would never be taken to task over this pure forgiveness, in fact rather that he would be considered meritorious by having allowed the murderer to have continued in life.

Do you not see how God has preferred the case where of those who were afflicted by the murder of one of their relatives and who have a right to demand retribution and from among whom only one man prefers forgiveness and the rest prefer the killing of the murderer? He agrees with only that man that either forgives alone or forgives with money, and He causes this one man's choice to be taken into account in preference to the rest.

Again, a person cannot be killed in retribution as recounted in the story that happened at the time of the Prophet. A man was killed, and the killed man's relative saw the rope that belonged to the dead man in the hands of another person, and seized him saying this man is the murderer, and wanted him killed, and the Prophet said: 'The killing of this man would be like another murder. The finding of the rope in the possession of the man cannot be considered enough proof to cause a retribution.' God said: 'The punishment for a sin is equal sin' (*wa jaza'û sayyi'atîñ sayyi'atun mithluka*), which means that although retribution is allowed by religion, it is still a sin. The act of retribution is an act of sin, though allowed by religion. If a man forgives a murderer and does not kill him, there is merit at the level of God for that person, because the life even of the murderer is in the Divine image. Of course this is so, since He made Man for His own Self, so that by him He can manifest His Names, Qualities and Completion. Consequently, to act with respect towards that creature which is in the image of *ḥaqq*, is to act with respect towards the *ḥaqq*.

God did not become manifest by the Name *ẓâhir* (Manifest) except by there being Man, because *insân* (Man) is the image of God. If a person respects Man, indeed he respects God, because God's image is the Name 'Manifest' of God, since He made him in His own image, and the maintenance of this is better than any other action. Then people might object and query and might say: 'If the man is in the image of God and is His Name *ẓâhir*, then one can never speak ill of Man.' The answer is that by virtue of his '*ayn*', Man cannot ever be spoken ill of; rather perhaps what can be spoken ill of are actions which emanate from him, to the extent that his actions are not the same as his '*ayn*', and our word concerns the '*ayn*', therefore one respects the '*ayn*' of Man, because it is in the image of God, and is God's Name Manifest (*ẓâhir*). Consequently, a man's '*ayn*' is never ill spoken of, but actions which are contrary to religion which emanate from him may be spoken ill of, because those actions are not the man's ipseity nor his '*ayn*', but

are contingent to him. And by his ipseity Man can never necessitate being ill spoken of, since ill-speaking is also only contingent, and can only affect the contingency emanating from Man.

Insân by its own ipseity is 'one who has been praised' (*maḥmūd*). Now this brings other questions, and here is the answer: if Man is ill spoken of because of his action, that action necessarily must belong to that man, but it has been said that all action is special and private to God, and there is no action belonging to anyone other than God. Yet here is a case that someone is blamed for his action, and praised for his action. The answer is: qualities necessitated by the animal *nafs* (*nafs-i-bahîma*) which emanate from the place of manifestation of the man, are blameable actions. Yet with all this at the level of the *nafs* demanding these to happen, it is again *ḥaqq* which brings them into being, and in the same way, the actions emanating from the peaceful *nafs* (*nafs-i-muslima*) and the disciplined *nafs* (*nafs-i-munqâda*) and the *nafs* in security (*nafs-i-mu'mina*) are actions which are *maḥmūd*. Whether these actions be referred to the man since they emanate from him, or to the *ḥaqq* since He is their creator and source.

The language of blame is equally blameable before God. If a man blames something not knowing exactly why that thing happens, that blame before God is equally a blame upon the man who says it. Among the people who have satisfaction in their *nafs*, they also find it blameable, because the person who has blamed has brought blame upon that which was manifested in him. In fact there is nobody blameable except that action which is blamed by religion, and the blame brought by religion is relative, being in consequence to the action which emanated in response. And another face of this, that religion finds an action blameable, is because the actor of this blameable action, by his addiction to what he does and his working on that addiction, is distanced from the *ḥaqq*, and this action puts him in animosity of the image of God. And that blame has no other use, except that it refers to the Divine image and to the servant and the person who explains this has no other purpose except to preserve the Divine image and the actor's ipseity, because that a religion or religious law finds something blameable is due to a wisdom to which God alone is privy, or to a person to whom God made it known. In fact retribution became part of religion for specific purposes wherein a kind of man was to be preserved, or to prevent from prolongation of the kind of man who is in animosity of boundaries imposed by the Divine.

There are two faces to this *âyat*. One is that by allowing retribution, there is life made possible for this special kind of man, so that a man who observes the retribution may be limited and prevented from murdering others. And the other face is that in the order of retribution, there is for you life, in that you pass beyond the execution of retribution and confer the continuation of life. In short, from what we have mentioned as indications, know this, you, that in fact God respects this emergence and its establishment, and you also respect this emergence, and you desire this, because it is by the respecting of this emergence that this happiness results. And could there be greater happiness for Man than to respect the Divine image? the goodness of which is incumbent on God and the goodness of which is God, and understand this.

Indeed the honour is such that since Man is *hayy* (life), for him is desired the completion of that quality, and its attainment, for which he is created. And the person who works for Man's destruction, in fact works to prevent that man's arrival at *kamâl*, for which Man was primarily created. In other words, the work is for the destruction of Man and for prevention of his reaching *kamâl*, which *kamâl* is the necessity of his '*ayn-i-thâbita* in the Divine Knowledge and according to which God had destined him. Consequently, that man works against God's decree, and works for the prevention of the taking place of God's destiny, therefore works against God. The killer who does this deed against one person, has also done this against the progeny of that person, preventing God's decree from happening, and has prevented the emergence of Man and not respected the emergence of Man, and has tried to prevent all the progeny from reaching *kamâl*, and he has prevented the coming into life of many *kâmil* people, and the totality of Divine images to come into fullness and continue life, and the man who works against this by killing one person, his punishment is according to that.

The Prophet said to the people who were fighting for the protection and establishment of Islam: 'Shall I tell you something that is much better than that you should reach the enemy and annihilate him, or that the enemy should reach you and kill you and make you a witness (*shâhid*); and that is the *dhikr* of God.' *Dhikr* of God is better for you than to fight for the word of God, and to die as the witness of God, though it is true that in the battle for the sake of God, the name of God is elevated and knowledge of God expanded and the good deed of

being killed in the way of God happens. But it is not equivalent to the ill (*sharr*) that ensues in the destruction of emblems of God. The explanation of why the *dhikr* of God is better than being killed for the sake of God is thus, that the honour is such that a person does not know the value and the destiny of the emergence of this humanity except if he has done the *dhikr* of God with the *dhikr* that is required of him. The *dhikr* that is required of him is this *dhikr*, wherein the man who is lost to his *nafs*, and where God alone does the *dhikr* of His *nafs* in the place of that manifestation, and where the man who does the *dhikr* and the thing that is rememorated and the rememoration itself become one thing. Because, in fact, the great God is the revelation to that person who does the *dhikr*, and it is that the *ḥaqq* who is the revelation to the man who is doing the *dhikr* is witnessed by he who is doing the *dhikr*, and if the *ḥaqq* which is the revelation to the man who is doing the *dhikr* is not observed, the revelation which is the *ḥaqq*, then in fact that man is not doing *dhikr*, because God has said: 'I am the revelation to the one who does My *dhikr*.' And the revelation to the man who is doing the *dhikr*, which is *ḥaqq*, is what the man who is doing the *dhikr* observes; therefore the man who observes the *ḥaqq* is really doing the *dhikr*, and the one who does not observe is not doing *dhikr*. The man who does the *dhikr* of God with all his parts and abilities observes Him, and tastes with *dhawq* the value and the destiny of this emergence. The observance of the *ḥaqq* and its witnessing is particular to this emergence, and this emblem of God which is the place of observance of the *ḥaqq* does not work for the destruction of the Lord; on the contrary, he will work for its establishment.

To do *dhikr* properly then, Man must do this *dhikr* of the *ḥaqq* with the totality of his ability and faculties to arrive at observance until he is doing *ḥaqq's dhikr* with the kind of *dhikr* that is required, because *dhikr* of God is contagious to the totality of the abilities and faculties of the servant. In other words, the servant, when he is doing the *dhikr*, does it with his spirit, his *nafs*, his heart and with the totality of his corporeal ability and power, and members of his body, and with all the strength of his soul and spirit. And the *dhikr* of God is contagious to all these. The man who specifically does the *dhikr* of the *ḥaqq* with his tongue does not do the special *dhikr*. In other words, unless he does it with all his ability and the totality of his being, the *dhikr* being done is not the *dhikr* called above as being specific to Man. Since the *dhikr* of God is contagious to all his being, only when he does it with all his

being does he do the *dhikr* of God and is with all his parts in observance of *ḥaqq*, and at the level of *ḥaqq* he observes his *nafs* as annihilated, and in fact it is this person who does the *dhikr* of *ḥaqq* and is in observance and who knows the *qadr* of emergence, and he has reached this observation through the medium of this emergence. And if his emergence had been destroyed before this, he would have been prevented from the majesty of this observance (*shuhûd*). In the same way, the totality of the *shuhûd* in this emergence being resultant at the level of the reality of the *dhikr*, therefore the observant *dhikr*-doer can only know the *qadr* of this emergence through observing *ḥaqq* in this emergence and is 'ârif of it. But if the man does the *dhikr* only with his tongue, who because he does the *dhikr* with the totality of his tongue and can emit no other sound except the *dhikr* through his tongue, then the vision and other possibilities of the man are in annihilation in his tongue, and the *ḥaqq*'s revelation of Itself is only the observation of the tongue and not of the vision. Therefore that man cannot know the destiny of this emergence.

Know this mystery then about the *dhikr* of people who are deficient in knowledge: because the deficient in knowledge is many with his parts and limbs and body, as he does not use all his abilities in the *dhikr*, only that limb of his which is doing the *dhikr* observes the *ḥaqq*, and the rest of his body and abilities are in ignorance. Surely the *dhikr*-doing member of that person without a doubt is present and in observance of God, and the remembered God is that part's revelation and that part is in observance of *ḥaqq*. And the unknowing parts of the servant are in ignorance by virtue of not knowing and not doing the *dhikr* of *ḥaqq*. Yet the *ḥaqq* is the revelation of a part of the deficient person.

Indeed Man is of many parts, and by virtue of these parts, is not single of the 'ayn, because there is established for each part an 'ayn. God, on the other hand, is unique of 'ayn and many in Names, just as Man is many in parts and one in 'ayn. And the *dhikr* of one part of him does not necessitate the *dhikr* of another part. And *ḥaqq* is the revelation of that part of the human being which is doing the *dhikr*, and the rest of the parts which are not doing the *dhikr* are qualified by deficiency. If it happens that one part of the man does the *dhikr* of God and God becomes the revelation of that part, the *ḥaqq* by Its munificence, by that part alone preserves the rest of the parts, but not because they deserve it. Therefore, that part is the cause of the preservation of

the rest of the parts, just as God by the being of the *kâmil* by His beneficence preserves the rest of the totality of parts. And consequently the rest of the parts do not become qualified by deficiency.

They might say: 'Does not the *haqq* Itself then destroy this emergence by His promised death to each?' You answer: 'From among men, the portion that does *dhikr* preserves the other portions.' 'But from God this emergence is alone and it is not preserved; it is not permanent.' And the answer is: the direction of the promised moment of natural death to each person is not a murder or execution, but instead a differentiation of the totality of the parts. God takes to Himself the reality and the spirit of the man, and the species are differentiated and each portion returns to its own origin, and nothing is annihilated except parts of the totality and the uniqueness of the image becomes differentiated, and God does not intend the destruction of this emergence by the promised death; what He intends is to return each person at his promised time to Himself. And all the totalities of the *amr* return to the *haqq*. And if when the great God has taken the whole of Man by virtue of the promised death to Himself, then He prepares another place for that spirit other than this one from the same species of this place to which Man is transported, and that place is the place of *baqâ*'.

When God has taken, through death, Man to Himself, and He has prepared another place for Man's spirit from the same kind to which Man is transposed, that place is the next world, which is the place of *baqâ*' (permanence). This permanence is because in its being there is complete temperance (*i'tidâl*). In other words, as Man in this emergence in this world is going by these means to the other Divine places, and when this place is left empty by death, the great God, for the reality of Man and for the spirit of Man, prepares another place from the same kind as that place to which Man is going to be transported. But the arrangement of that place of *nûthâl* is composed of the bodily and spiritual powers, overriding characters and qualities and beliefs, and from the spirituality of these. That is to say, if that transported man's powers and realities and characters and qualities are Divine realities and characters and qualities of the Lord, then his transposition into this other world is pleasant and repose together with the *haqq*. And from that same order of this place of pleasantness and from the powers and characters mentioned above, when this new place has been arranged for him, here again the spirit of that man which is Divine

spirit and complete spirit, God then again like He did at the beginning — ‘and I blew into him of My Spirit’ (*wa nafakhta fihi min ruhî*) — blows again into that body of *mithâl* and of *barzakh* and of the other world and of spirit; and the man stops his degrees in which there is no change for ever of evers in the Divine and second world degrees stops his gradations and never varies, because this place is *baqâ*’ and is upon temperance (*i’tidâl*), and also because that place and its population is composed of the jewels. But if the person who is going to be transferred to the other world is not of this kind, for him is arranged another world according to his jewel and character and other possibilities; and Man never receives death in that second world, which means his parts do not become differentiated, because *i’tidâl*, which is necessary for the continuous arrival, is present in the later emergence. Because it emerges from the purest and most real of the jewels.

Although each individual of mankind, by virtue of his secondary inclination and his dominant quality, requires an individually specialized place for himself composed to his necessity, the great God, due to certain causes, puts the totality of them all into three kinds. The first kind are the *muqarrrahîn*, which are the prophets, the envoys, the *kâmil awliyâ*’, and all the people of *iṭlâq* (absoluteness — divorced from immanence). For these people when they have been transferred, they are not enclosed and conditioned, and for these people this world is not preferable to the other world by virtue of their *iṭlâq*; by their ipseity they circumscribe and contain the totality of Divine *ḥaḍarât* and Names and the knowledge of possibilities of the lower kind. The second kind are the people of the right, and these are some special and general kinds of *awliyâ*’, and by their degrees the whole total of the people of beliefs, and these people are, because they are imitators, those of them who have transferred to the other world, because in them certain orders of unity and certain orders of plurality were present, in little time they are annihilated by orders which contain distinction, and orders which contain union, and in some of them the orders of oneness and the orders of plurality are equally balanced, and these, after the first division, in a length of time, by virtue of the power or weakness of plurality, the orders of union take over the orders of plurality, and in some of them the orders of plurality conquer the orders of union, yet since the order of oneness is like a leaven in them, in the resultant dough, this leaven transforms the orders of plurality and the plurality changes into oneness. And in this way a man who has been

transferred to the other world, if he has in his heart the slightest atom of belief, he is saved by the intercession of the Envoy and finds safety. There remains not one person from among the people of beliefs in hell, and for these people the *rahmah* passes over the anger. The third category are the people of the left who cover the Truth, or polytheists: because we know that people of the next world are also in development there is no need to expound on the first two categories, but only on the third. Those who are people of the fire, their condition is such that they end in munificence (*na'im*) and their end is munificence and mercy. But all the same they are in the fire, because when the period of retribution is finished, it is impossible for the duration of the fire to be cool and peaceful for that which happens to be in it. There are four *amrs* in this. One is that people who are forever in the fire, their condition is upon munificence, and this order is that they are forever in the fire, and this does not disturb the people who cover the Truth, because *na'im* does not prevent them from being in the fire, because their pleasure is in being in the fire and they are forever in the fire. But as has been mentioned in many places and times, pain and suffering is removed from them, equally by cutting away of sorrow, or by virtue of some of the Names interceding with other Names, or by the *rahmah* taking precedence over the anger. And one order is this, that the ending of the period of retribution is in the fire, and one order is this, that fire becomes cool and peaceful for those that are in it, and their condition becomes munificence and mercy though they are in the fire, because after the death of retribution it is impossible for the fire's duration to be coolness and peace, because the fact of the fire's burning is for retribution, and when the retribution is finished the fire becomes cool. And when the fire cools, its heat which was giving pain to its inhabitants is removed and their condition becomes munificence, and the reason why retribution ends is that punishment of faults is a gift of *qadar*, (and *qadar* applies to immanence) and the errors that emanate from the servants in this world (immanence) are not eternal. When the punishment is finished, fire becomes cold, because fire is a servant ordered to punish and does that through its quality of heat. And when the lifting of the punishment happens, then its quality of heat is replaced by its contingent quality which manifests as coolness and peace, because in the elements, continuous change is necessary, therefore that which was hot eventually becomes cold, and the punishment thereby stops. And the munificizing of these people is after the

dues to God and the dues to the servant are deducted, like what happened when the *khalil* of God was thrown into the fire and that fire into which he was thrown became coldness and peace. (When Ibn 'Arabi spoke of the resemblance of the fire of the *khalil* of God and the fire that is used for punishment for people who are enemies of God, and protestations occurred, that how could it be that the *khalil* of God should be compared with people of the fire, 'Arabi answered as follows: Abraham, peace be on him, equally suffered, but only by the vision of the fire. and equally due to his knowledge that a being of the animal kind, if it comes near fire, it is certain that that person will suffer. And when they started to throw him into the fire, at the level of his vision he suffered, but his suffering was through his *wahm* whereas the suffering of the people of the fire is sensory. This happened because Abraham, peace be on him, before and at the time of being thrown into the fire, did not know what God intended. That is to say, he did not know that in the 'ayn of suffering God was showing him comfort and munificence. After he was thrown into the fire, Abraham, after having gone through the existence of these sufferings of *wahm*, found the fire cool and of peace concerning his own *nafs*, although he was observing at the same time the image of the colour of the fire. But the image of the fire in his case became cool and peace and not the fire that burns, whereas that image of colour remained in the eyes of the people still as fire, and they thought the fire was burning Abraham. It is that one thing can be different in the eyes of the onlookers by virtue of the state of the onlookers. For instance, the person who is hot sees the air fiery, and the person who is cold sees the air as freezing. In short, fire for the *khalil*, may he be in peace, was coolness and peace, and fire in the eyes of the people who were watching.)

The order of the revelation of God is like this. If you want you can say indeed God revealed Himself like the revelation of this *amr*, or if you want you can say indeed, people of immanence with the eye looking at things and looking at things through vision are like the *haqq* in matters of revelation. That is to say, in revelation *haqq* is variable as He is variable. At the level of revelation God is different in the eyes of the onlooker, that is to say, while the revelation of the *haqq* is one, in the eyes of the onlooker by virtue of his own mood, that is to say by virtue of the spirituality or corporeality, or by virtue of the changes between the Divine Qualities and by virtue of one Quality overriding the other, and by virtue of the mood that arises from all this, *haqq*

becomes variable and changing in revelation. And this is because the revelation of the *ḥaqq* manifests in all places. Because it so happens that the onlooker sometimes sees one revelation and observes it in one way, and in another moment he observes it in another way, by virtue also of the difference in the modes of being in each of the onlookers, one revelation becomes different. In short, you can also say the universe becomes different in the eye of the onlooker by virtue of the mode of the onlooker as God becomes different at the level of revelation, or you can say by virtue of the revelation the *ḥaqq* becomes different, or you can say the mode of the onlooker becomes different since the revelation varies, or you can say the mode of the onlooker varies because of the difference in revelation. This means to say, the onlooking of the *ʿārif* which is free of the conditions of modes, changes by virtue of the changes of Divine revelations, because an *ʿārif* is *ʿārif* by virtue of revelation and the varied Divine revelations are infinite. All these considerations are permissible in reality, that is to say, because *ḥaqq* manifests in every place of manifestation, it is permissible to say that His revelation is consequent to the place of manifestation if for the person who is looking, the condition is definite. Also, that the servant be by virtue of the revelation is equally possible, if the servant is free of specific condition; that is, if the servant is not conditioned by any of the qualities of relativity and is manifest according to absoluteness in that case, revelation in him is not one different to another since the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself to him according to His Absolute Ipseity. Equally it is possible for the mode of the vision of the servant to be different due to the revelation, as the *ḥaqq* changes the heart of the complete servant, so that his heart is subject to the Divine changes. Consequently, the onlooker's mood changes by virtue of the revelation, and also his heart changes with the changes of the *ḥaqq* with the revelations of the *ḥaqq*, and the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the onlooker becomes changeable in relation to the *ʿārif* who is not complete, because *ḥaqq* is revealed to him by virtue of his heart.

And if the dead or the killed, whether he is a submissive or rebellious servant or whatever person that is killed, whether he is killed by infliction of injustice or justice, that is to say, whether he is dead or killed, if any dead did not return to God, God would not have given the *ḥukm* for the death of anybody, and would not even have allowed death in religion. But all dead or killed return to God, and remain after death by the servanthood of the Reality, because the Lordship of the

ḥaqq is dependent on the lorded-ness. And this is constant. And consequently the servanthood of the servant and its lorded-ness by God is constant. In short, the totality of the dead are in the hands of God.

There is no stopping or non-happening concerning death. And death does not make him non-existent. God allowed in religion killing because He knows He does not lose the servant and servanthood does not get lost from the killed, and servanthood returns to him when emergence from this world reverts to the emergence from the other world. In fact, the servant never ceases to fall into non-existence where *ḥaqq* is concerned, because nothing is outside of Him, because it includes both the manifest and the *bâtin*. That is to say that when the servant is taken away from the manifest Lordship of the Lord by virtue of death or murder it becomes the *bâtin*, where the *bâtin rabb* becomes the director and orderer over him. God therefore never ceases to translate him from one emergence to another, from one homeland to another, where the second homeland is better than the one before. So He takes him from one manifestation of revelation and puts him into another manifestation of revelation, which second revelation is higher and better and lighter and purer than the first. The *huwīyyah* of the *ḥaqq* which is individuated in the servant returns in fact to the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* Himself, as is pointed out in the words: 'To Him returns all the *amr*' (*wa ilayhi yurja'u al-amru kulluhu*). And this shows very clearly in fact that that which returns to the *ḥaqq* is the same thing as the *ḥaqq*, since the *ḥaqq*, by the observance by revelation in the *a'yân* of actor and acted upon, is manifest and individuated. Which means that the *a'yân* of immanence are the same as the *ḥaqq* and the *amr* returns to Him.

Taşarruf happens in God, because the images of creation and action which happen in manifestation are manifest and individuated when the *ḥaqq* is in *bâtin*. He is *mutaşarrif* because the Divine images of action and Names which happen in the *bâtin* are individuated in the *zâhir*. Nothing emanated from the *ḥaqq* which is not the same as the *ḥaqq*; perhaps rather the *huwīyyah* of the *ḥaqq* is the same as that thing, and equally nothing returned to the *ḥaqq* which is not the same as that thing. In fact what returns to Him is His own *huwīyyah*. This face which we have just mentioned is that which the Divine *kashf* gives in the words of God (*wa ilayhi yurja'u al-amru kulluhu*), because the Unique Ipseity is revealed in the images of the *a'yân* and the images of

the *a'yân* is the same as His Knowledge which happens in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*. Those images of being are not additive *amrs* to the *ḥaqq*, because the *ḥaqq*'s images of knowledge is His Ipseity of things and is apparent from the *ḥaqq* by the Being of the *ḥaqq*. While they were in the *a'yân-i-thâbita* in the Divine Knowledge they belonged to the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the fact that He had seized them into His Ipseity — 'And then We seized them to Us with effective seizing' (*thumma qabaḍnâ ilayna qabḍan yasīran*).

Of the Wisdom of the Unknowable
(*al-ḥikmat al-ghaybiyyah*)
in the Word of Job

WHEN water, which is the same as the Ipseity of Uniqueness, became the origin of all life, God made water the image of life and knowledge. because life, which is the same as the Ipseity of Uniqueness, was first represented in the images of the spirits, and after that in the images of the elements. Thereby, also, water is the origin of the elements. 'And We brought life into everything from water' (Quran).

Know that the mystery of life became fluent in water. In other words, the mystery of life became manifest in the image of water. Water is the origin of all the elements and fundamentals, and consequently God brought life into everything from water. And there is nothing in existence which is not alive, because absolutely in reality there is nothing in existence which does not praise (*tasbīḥ*) God by giving Him grace, but we cannot understand its praise except through Divine revelation (*kashf*); and nothing renders grace to God unless it is alive. Consequently everything is alive. And the origin of everything is water because the origin of everything is life. The fact that life is fluent in water, and that everything has life through water is definitely realized by the Divine Being (*huwiyyah*) manifesting with the Breath of Compassion (*nafas-ar-raḥmân*) and by the Breath of Compassion, being fluent in everything. Accordingly, life pervades the totality of the realities of the necessities of Names and the realities of the possibilities of creation, and water is fluent in the totality of the fundamentals and elements and all the things that are engendered by water by virtue of the individuation (*ta'ayyun*) in water of the Breath of Compassion and the Being of God.

Thus the Shaykh takes water as the origin for all the elements and the fundamentals. Do you not see how the Throne, that is to say, the bodily Throne which is the *primum mobile* (*falak-al-aṭlas*), rested on water? Because without a doubt the Throne became immanenced from the steam of water which arose from heat. Consequently, the image

of the Throne became manifest upon water, and water protects the Throne from underneath.

Some say that the white pearl which God first created is the Prime Intellect from which all the immanences are immanenced. The fact that God looked at it with the eye of Majesty (*jalâl*) individuated it, which is God's veiling Himself, because the look (*naẓar*) of Beauty (*jamâl*) is the revelation of the Divine Face by Its own Light (*nûr*), and the look of Majesty is the veiling of the Divine Face by otherness. And the dissolving of the pearl at the level of its annihilation by the quiddity of the possibilities of non-existence and equally at the level of the immanencing from it of all things, is its manifestation in all things, because that pearl is like the *materia prima* to the totality of the images of possibilities. One half of it is igneous, and is the immanencing of the spirits with luminous (*nûr*) individuations. Do you not see that when Moses arrived at the Ancient Spirit, God named it 'fire' and said to him: 'Blessed are those who are of the fire and those who are around it', and also: 'Familiarize yourself with that which is of fire on the side of the Mountain'? And its other half is aqueous, from which bodies are immanenced, because *prima materia* is the filled sea, which means filled by images.

In short, the Throne, which is the Universe of the universes, manifested upon this water, and by virtue of the fact that the images of bodies manifested in the *prima materia*, water became the interior (*bâtin*) beneath it, just as the *prima materia* is interior. Under these considerations, the point of view proposed in this matter by David of Caesarea does not follow, because the totality of things which are included in existence are created from the First Intellect, and Intellect is like the *prima materia* for the images of things, and Intellect is fluent and interior in all the images of things, but is manifest by virtue of place, and in the images of perfections is manifest by total image. Even if there were 100,000 images in one state, yet if the inclination of one of them is towards completeness (*kamâl*), it will manifest by a total manifestation. And this does not necessitate that Intellect should become destroyed and annihilated, but rather it would manifest in detail in the images of intellects and the selves.

The Throne is immanenced by water and manifested upon water and was raised; and water preserves it from beneath exactly as God created Man as servant, that is to say, created him with the quality of servanthood, which is the opposite of being elevated and full of pride. But

Man became elevated according to his Lord and was manifested according to Him, yet God preserves from beneath with His Being the servant who is full of pride and self-elevation and disobedience, by looking at the servant who is ignorant of himself, or equally by looking at the elevatedness of the servant who is ignorant of his Lord. That is to say, although the man by virtue of his reality claims Lordship from God for his place of advance and the elevation of his rank, and because he is ignorant of himself and his Lord, he manifests with that quality of self-aggrandizement, yet God preserves him from beneath. And if He did not, he would have become non-existent.

In reality the being of the servant is none other than the image of the individuation of the Being of God revealing Himself upon the servant. Of course the individuation is high and manifest over that thing through which it is individuated, and that which is individuated is the Being of God which is covered over by the individuation of servanthood. If God had not preserved the individuation of the servant, in which is individuated the Being of God, certainly it would have become non-existent, because individuation has no reality without there being that which is individuated, because individuating without there being an individuated is destructive.

That God preserves His servant from beneath is the meaning of the Prophet's saying: 'If you lowered a rope, it would fall upon God.' The Prophet pointed in this *ḥadīth* to the fact that the relationship of 'underneath' to God is the same as the relationship of 'above' to God, as indicated in the words: 'They fear their Lord who is above them', and: 'He is the destroyer over His servants.' That is to say, the relationship of above and below to God is equal, because God encompasses both the outward and the interior and the above and the below, and 'He is with you wherever you be; if you are buried in the earth He is with you, and in whichever dwelling you appear, He is with you.' Consequently, as they fear God from above, and as God strikes them and destroys them from above, He destroys them in the same way from underneath, and one is afraid of not being protected. Do you not see how individuation would exist no more if the revelation which is in individuating were to return to the individuator? And since above or below with reference to God is equal, the six directions do not manifest except with respect to Man, or even except through Man, who is also in the image of the Compassionate (*raḥmān*), and the fact that God preserves the servant from beneath does not prevent God from

being above, since God encompasses above and below. That the man is in the image of the Compassionate is because he encompasses all the Names and because Compassion is in every opposing direction and includes all the Names.

There is no sustenance other than God. Indeed God said concerning the two groups of people, that is, the people of Moses and the people of Jesus: 'If only they had established the ordinances (*aḥkām*) of the Torah and the Gospels'; having thus specified, He then generalized by saying; 'and what was brought down to them from their Lord', meaning if they had also established that which was brought down to them from their Lord in whichever way it was brought down to them. All ordinance brought down to them by the tongue of the envoy is included in the words of God where He says: '. . . brought down to them from their Lord.' In other words, whether it was brought down to them by the envoy or inspired into their hearts from God, the people of Moses and the people of Jesus absorbed that from above. That which is fed and taught from above related to God, and God related that which they ate 'from below their feet' to Himself through the Prophet, who is an interpreter from God, by saying: 'If you lower a rope it falls on God.' Thus, for God the relationship of above and below is equal. As God teaches and feeds from above, so He does from below, and in reality, feeding from above is feeding with revelations from the Presences of the Names and gifts from Lordship, and feeding from below is what results from following with the feet in the way of God which is feeding with that which comes from God. Thus God encompasses all the directions and protects the servant from all directions, and the preservation of the servant is the nourishing of the servant from above and below. Were that nourishment to be cut off, the servant would be destroyed.

If the Throne were not upon water and if water did not preserve it from beneath, the bodily being of the Throne would not be preserved, because the existence of that which is alive is preserved by life. Do you not see the person who is alive with the sensation of life, when the normal death kills him, the Divine revelation which was preserving him from beneath returns to its origin, the parts of his composition disintegrate and equally his powers are rendered non-existent from that particular composition, because the life of everything is from water, and water is the image of life, and the Throne is preserved by water which is the image of life. And since the Throne, which is striped with

all directions, is preserved from beneath by water, in the same way the other images of the universes and elements and fundamentals are equally preserved in the best way from beneath, because the Throne necessarily includes all those, because the word '*arsh* (Throne) implies each thing of existence, because each existent is the Throne and the place of manifestation of the Divine Names. Consequently, the totality of things is the Divine Throne. If the Divine Life, which preserves everything in the image of water from beneath, returned to its origin, the particular order of that thing would be made void, because that natural warmth which is the life of the living is preserved by the natural dampness. So the life of the heat results from the image of the dampness of water, and when that dampness is inexistent, death occurs, and the disintegration of the parts of Man arises from that. Consequently, the Shaykh, having elucidated the prefaces relating to the manner and taste of Job, began his explanation.

God said to Job: 'Strike the ground with your foot for this is water for washing the body'; that is cool water. When Job struck the ground with his foot, from the ground rose a life-giving spring, and Job washed with that water and drank from it. By that single stroke of the foot upon the earth, God removed from Job all the ill that was attached to his soul (*nafs*) and to his body. Job was suffering from excessive fever, and God calmed that fever by the coolness of the water. Satan had perpetuated that fever in Job's body for seven years, and by cooling the fever with the water God gave Job recovery of health. In other words, as medicine, God diminished the fever by increasing the peace (*salâm*) of the coolness. Because of this, medicine consists in the diminishing of the excess and the increasing of the deficient. In other words, medicine consists, in nature, in the decreasing of what is excessive in the balance and in increasing that which is deficient in the balance.

The goal of medicine is equilibrium, and there is no way to achieve this except by coming close to it. Thus, what is required of medicine is equilibrium, but there is no way to achieve this real equilibrium except in so far as the equilibrium of Man is close to the real equilibrium. We said there is no possibility of equilibrium because in truth, reality and witnessing constantly bestow the self with the immanencing (*takwîn*), because at every instant things are in a new creation and in a new immanencing. Immanencing cannot happen except by inclination, and this inclination, where it applies to nature, is called deviation (*inḥirâf*)

or decay (*ta'affin*), and where it applies to God it is called Divine Will (*irâdah*); Divine Will inclines towards a specific aim or order, rather than towards another aim or order. Equilibrium in its totality requires uniformity, so that there be no inclination or deviation towards one side, but uniformity to all sides. And this order (*amr*) is not existent, and nothing like it in the universe could come into existence, because what would then exist would be like solid things and would not be changeable and variable. Because of this We have forbidden the order of equilibrium in this universe, because the universe is manifest from the source of deviation, and at each instant it is in inclination and deviation. Grammatically, it is also allowable to say that we have been forbidden by God the order of equilibrium. Therefore, what is required is the equilibrium which is the closest to the real balance.

Certainly in the Divine knowledge of the prophets God is qualified by agreement and anger and by qualities which are opposed. But agreement nullifies anger, and anger equally nullifies the agreement of that which has been agreed upon. Balance is in anger and agreement being equal, but it is not possible to have equality in anger and agreement at the same time, and it is not possible for a person to be angry with another person at the same time that he agrees with him. Consequently, the person who is going to show anger has inclined to one of the orders, and the choice of one of the orders, in this case anger, is inclination. Equally, the person who is in agreement with someone cannot be in agreement with him if he is angry with that person, and consequently he has chosen one of the orders, in this case agreement, in preference to the other, and has inclined to agreement. In one person in one state, God cannot be qualified both with agreement and with anger, unless there is union between agreement and anger and no inclination one way or the other. Consequently, even in the Divine Qualities there is not equilibrium in this respect.

We said that the choice of one of the orders of qualification is inclination, because of a person who thinks that in reality the Wrath of God is perpetual upon the people of the fire who cover the Truth, and is never annulled. That is, he thinks that the people of the fire are perpetually the place of manifestation of the Wrath of God, and for those people the order of agreement from God does not exist. According to him the desired aim of these people becomes true, since the qualification of inclination is anger, which is one of the two orders. And inclination is lack of equilibrium. But if the order is as we have

just said, that the fate of the people of the fire is mercy and removal of suffering, even though they are resident in the fire, then the removal of suffering in their case is agreement. Consequently, by the removal of suffering, anger is annulled, because anger is the same as the suffering. If you would understand, you would understand in reality, since pain is consequent to anger, just as the person who is angry certainly suffers in his self and will not wreak vengeance upon the person with whom he is angry by putting him into pain, except that by giving pain he wishes to find repose (*râḥah*) in his self. Consequently, the pain which appears at the level of the one who is angry is transferred to the person with whom he is angry, and therefore in this case also God becomes qualified by agreement, which is the choice of one of the orders, and equilibrium is removed.

If you singularize God from this universe, by Grandeur and Exaltedness, then He will be aggrandized to such a degree that He would be rich beyond need of finding ease in Himself by passing His anger on to the one He is angry with. But if you were to consider that the Identity (*huwiyyah*) of God is the identity of the universe, then all the orders cannot manifest except in God since He is the identity of the universe, and since God and His orders extend from God upon the universe. What is meant by the saying of God: 'All order returns to Him', is that the totality of the universe in its reality and in its revelation returns to God; and what is manifest in the universe is the Identity of God. Consequently, pray and be servant to God whichever thing you face, though you be veiled and covered, trust in Him and appoint Him your Attorney (*wakīl*). That is to say, though you are veiled or covered, pray to Him and be confident in Him, because the short intelligences and weak comprehensions are veiled from understanding the reality of the universe, and putting your trust in Him (*tawakkul*) happens in the state of being veiled. Thus, even though God is covered and veiled from your vision, pray and put your trust in Him and ask that He bestow on you the witnessing and the closeness (*yaqīn*) by removing the veil and lifting the cover.

In short, in the universe of possibilities there is no universe more beautifully constructed (*badī'*) and more total than this universe, because in fact the reality is that God brought it into being according to the image of Compassion (*rahmân*). The Shaykh, having considered the identity of the universe as being the same as the Identity of God, then made it understood, by saying that He brought the universe into

being according to the image of Compassion, that the universe is a later being which explains the bringing about. That is to say, God brought into being the universe, which means that the Being of God became manifest with the being of the universe. In other words, the manifestation of the Being of God became the same as the manifestation of the universe, that is to say, the Being of God became manifest in the image of the universe, just as Man, with his body and his image and his spirituality and his corporeality, manifested with the being of the image of Nature. And we who are the essences of the universe are the manifested images of God, and the Identity of God is the spirit of this manifested image and is the arranger (*tadbîr*) of this image and educates it from within (*bâtin*). And the arranging did not happen except in the Being of God whose manifested image is the image of the universes. Arranging never existed except from God and by extending from the Identity of God which is the spirit of the image of the universe.

Thus God is First (*awwal*) by virtue of meaning, because He is the beginning; and also God is the Last (*âkhir*), by virtue of image. That is to say, as God's image is manifest in our image, He is also the Manifest by virtue of change and predications and states, and also He is the Hidden (*bâtin*) by virtue of arranging (*tadbîr*), and God is the Knower of all (*'alîm*), and He is Witness over everything (*shahîd*), so that everything comes to know Him through the knowledge which benefits from witnessing (*shuhûd*), and not through the knowledge which benefits from thought (*fikr*), because in witnessing and in presence there is no thought. Thus, knowledge from witnessing (*shuhûd*) is the knowledge of closeness (*yaqîn*), whereas knowledge appertaining to thought or opinion is conjectural and relative knowledge and is not knowledge of closeness. What is meant is that one should know God by knowledge which benefits from witnessing and not by knowledge which benefits from thought or opinion, as knowledge of God is through witnessing and essential and is not derivative knowledge. Equally, the knowledge of tastes (*dhawq*) which come to the prophets and envoys while travelling on the path of God, also benefits from witnessing, not from thought, and the knowledge which benefits from witnessing is the true knowledge because it also appertains to taste. It is impossible that it should appear otherwise. What is other than this is supposition and probability which is absolutely not knowledge, because that which is really known cannot be observed or known by it.

This is so because of the difference of the ability in each person behind the veils and curtain, where the determination (*ḥukm*) is consequent to the domination of supposition. It is not a determination resultant from witnessing and visual specification. And if the knowledge which is other than the knowledge of revelation (*kashf*) and witnessing (*shuhūd*) were true knowledge, there would be no variability and there would be no manifestation of various beliefs. There would exist only one knowledge and one belief; and one knowledge is God's Knowledge alone, by which and in which the reality of all things is known and witnessed. All things are known to God in the Presence of Knowledge; in whatever image they are identified, God knows them according to that. Even the knowledge of the Perfect Man, who, being liberated from the conditions of conjecture and beliefs of supposition, has reached the Divine Knowledge, and is perhaps even the place of reception of that Knowledge, is also knowledge of witnessing and knowledge of closeness, and he observes the order in the Divine Knowledge, exactly as it is.

After that, that water became a drink for Job (may peace be on him) to eliminate the pain of thirst which was appointed in him, and the torment which was the Satan's touch on him, so that he would be distanced from understanding the realities as they are, by which understanding he would be in the place of closeness. Now, that is to say he touched Job with that pain so that Job be distanced. In short, God eliminated that thirst and the torture of suffering by that cold water. And Satan (*shayṭān*) is the word derived from *shaṭun* which means being far from the Truth, and becoming far off, and remoteness, and he is called *shayṭān* because he is very far away from understanding God and comprehending the realities, and the word *shayṭān* is a superlative case and this is applied to him because of his extreme distance. Thus the Shaykh interpreted *shayṭān* as remoteness.

Each thing witnessed is close to the eye, even if in distance it is far from it, because in fact vision reaches a thing by virtue of witnessing it. If there had been no reaching it by the eye, the eye would not be able to witness it. Or the reverse is equally true, that that which is observed reaches the eye. Whatever the case may be, witnessing gives reaching, and reaching gives closeness, and this closeness of the eye is according to both the beliefs, whether the light of the eye emanates from the eye or, as in the second case, whether the object seen imprints itself upon the eye. Here the Shaykh refers to the differences of opinion

among the wise men who adhere to one way or the other. Either way, the emanation of light from the eye or the object being imprinted on the eye, closeness results, because there is closeness between the observing eye and that which is observed; consequently all that is witnessed is close, whether it is far in distance or near.

In the same way as distance is close, Job made allusion by the words concerning Satan's touch and the pain, and he attributed the touch to Satan, although the touch was close to him and Satan was far from him. It is as if Job said: 'Distance is close to me because of what the wisdom existing in me necessitates, because Satan is far.' Thus Job attributed the touch which appointed the pain on him to Satan, while the touch is in fact close to him. In the language of allusion, it comes to mean: 'Satan which is far became close to me, with the touch of appointment of pain due to what the wisdom which is in me necessitated.' And that wisdom is his being veiled from the individuation of God through individuation, and his being distanced from God by the dominance of the veil of individuation. Consequently, due to the relationship of distance, the Satan, which is distance from God, came close to Job. Another wisdom in this situation of Satan touching Job is that, as the veil of individuation distanced him from God, Job desired to be tested by the touch of pain and the visiting upon him of suffering, so that that veil be burned by the fire of trial and testing and by the fire of pain and inflammation, in order to be cured from his spiritual illness of distance and veiling by the Divine medicine and thereby reach the essential closeness. Thus God assigned to Job the Satan, who is the place of manifestation of the Name Awe, Majesty and Wrath (*jalâl*), so that the veil which is of the remnants of his being and of the necessities of his individuation be burnt by the fire of trial, and so that during the period of trial he would consequently manifest in complete servanthood and impotence, and in a state of complete facing he would pray and plead, until the mirror of his heart be clear of all colours and images of individuation and of the sound of plurality and multiplicity and become the place of manifestation of the total Essential Divine revelation. In this way, that which is distanced becomes close, and the closeness of distance to him causes closeness. In fact the touching of Job by the Satan with suffering is due to that meaning, because the words: '... except My servants, upon whom you have no power', is definite, and it cuts away absolutely any kind of power of Satan over the servants of God.

Now certainly you have come to know that distance and closeness are two qualifying orders, where closeness is related to certainty and application, and distance is related to the lack of this and to deviation. Therefore, closeness and distance are two relationships which have no existence of their own, essentially and in reality, although the rules and orders of distance and closeness are existent. In other words, the relationship of God to each one of the totality of existents is at the same level. The Person (*janâb*) of the Ipseity is completely transcendent from closeness or distance, and closeness and distance exist only as two qualifying orders by virtue of the actions and the states of the servants, and they have no existence in reality. The predications of these two orders are established in that which is close and that which is distant. Thus, because closeness and distance are two accidental qualities, Satan, who is distanced from God, is essentially close, since he exists through the existence of God, and since he is the place of manifestation of the Name 'Misleader' (*muḍill*), and Job, may peace be on him, though he was essentially close, because of his deviation from balance (*i'tidâl*) was in the essence of distance. And do not forget and do not be veiled from the fact that closeness and distance are two accidental qualities, and the closeness is in the distance, and the distance is in the closeness.

Now know that the reason why God showed us the mystery of Job's illness is to provide us with an example, and so that the people of Mohammed read the lines of this book according to their state; and this is a lesson to those people so that they learn from what befell Job, who is the subject of this book, and this is due to God's desire to honour them. That is to say, God made Job, with all his states, an example to us; how Job was first afflicted, then, by virtue of his patience in affliction, how he was saved, and He made example of the various ills that befell Job, together with his salvation and return to health in response to his patience, so that the people of Mohammed read this book of Job according to their state. Thus, this book is a lesson so that they learn about affliction and patience and well-being and salvation, so that when affliction strikes them, they are patient, and when the order of testing is completed, they concord with the Divine order to pray that this affliction be removed from them. And like Job, who was the original subject of this affliction, they join his station in agreement and in punishment. That He did this is to honour the people of Mohammed, so that the

perfection of Job be manifest in them and so that they become heirs of his degree.

God praised Job with patience. Even though Job prayed and asked for the removal of patience, yet in spite of that God praised him with patience. In fact we know for certain if a servant prays to God for the removal of an affliction from him, this prayer does not diminish the servant's patience, and indeed that servant remains patient and indeed he is an excellent servant, which means that it does not prevent the servant being qualified with this by God. In fact God said of Job that he was excessively desirous of returning to God and not of returning to the causes. Consequently he is twice praised, first by virtue of his patience when afflicted with ill, then for his desire to return, wherein he referred completely to God for the removal of affliction.

And where the Shaykh said: '. . . and not to return to the cause', there arose an objection from a questioner, that since God is the source of all causes, then to say he does not want to return to the causes means he does not want to return to God. The answer is that God is the Actor at the level of the return of the servant to God through a cause, because in reality the servant is dependent on Him and not dependent on the causes, because all the many causes are no other than orders, whereas the Causer is the One Essence. And this is the return of the servant to God, the One of Essence, who, because of his suffering, had slipped from Him. And this is better than returning to the specific cause, because the specific cause might well not be in accordance with the Divine Knowledge concerning that thing; that is to say, it might not be established in the Divine Knowledge that that cause is for the purpose of removing the affliction, and that which is not established in the Divine Knowledge will not result in this. Or it might be that it is established in the Divine Knowledge as its cause but it is established there for a certain time in a definite period, whereas the servant prays at a different time. Then the servant, if he were to return to the specific cause and see that what he required is not given to him, might say: 'God did not comply with and accept my prayer.' But he did not ask of *God*, but rather he inclined to the specific cause which necessitated time, because effects which manifest through cause are dependent upon specific time. What is best for the servant is this: that he return to God who is One of Essence from all causes; and whichever cause from among causes His Wisdom gives him, He will remove that affliction, and bestow what is necessary.

Job acts through Divine Wisdom, and is patient in the face of affliction when the Divine Wisdom requires that, and when it is necessary he prays for the removal of affliction. It is known that a group of Sufis believe that patience is to restrain the soul from complaint, and they say that the limit of patience is the refraining from complaint absolutely, whether that complaint be to God or to others. However, for us at our level, there is no such limit to patience. On the contrary, at our level the limit of patience is to refrain from complaint to other than God, and not to refrain from complaint to God, because God ordered us to appeal to Him and to appeal is complaint to God, and complaining to God does not diminish patience. Thus, God veiled those people from knowing the reality of the order, because they thought by complaining, the complainer is prevented from agreement to destiny (*qadâ'*), whereas in reality the order is not like this. The complainer does not prevent his agreement to the destiny by complaining. In reality complaint to God or even to others does not prevent agreement to the destiny. Perhaps it does prevent agreement to what has happened as a result of destiny, but we have never been told to agree with the resultant effect of destiny, and ill is that thing which is the result of destiny. Ill is not the same as destiny. Thus, to complain of the ill which is the result, and to work for the removal of that, does not diminish one's agreement to the destiny. That which is pronounced as sentence is an order which is demanded by the essence, state and inclination of the person who is to be sentenced, and the decree is God's predication to that order. Thus, it is not necessary to be in agreement with the sentence, as disagreement with the sentence does not mean disagreement with the decree itself.

The Ancients have given us this example: if a sick man being treated by a doctor is to take a terrible-tasting poison or is to be treated by burning, the sick man is absolutely certain that he will suffer from what the doctor proposed. Yet he knows well that what the doctor proposed is due to his higher wisdom in medicine and that he will be cured of his ill. If he then complained to the doctor and asked him to remove the possible pain from him by exchanging for another medicine which is easier to bear, this order of complaint by the sick man would not prevent the patient's agreement with the decree (*qadâ'*) of the doctor over him, but would only be disagreement with the kind of medicine proposed.

Job came to know that in restraining the soul from complaint to

God, there is resistance to God's all-conquering power, and resisting the power of God is the ignorance which invests the person. And if God has afflicted someone, and if the person who suffers from that affliction does not pray to God to have that painful order removed from him, that person is in ignorance of the knowledge as it should be, and consequently does not know what is the purpose of that affliction and does not know for whom he is working when he works for the removal of that affliction. At the level of the servant who wants to know the reality of things, perhaps it is most suitable for the servant who is afflicted to ask for God's help and to ask God for the removal of that order from him. At the level of the gnostic who is the possessor of insight (*kashf*), for a servant to ask for the removal of that order from himself is to remove it from the Divine Person.

In fact God qualified Himself with being pained and He mentioned 'those who pain God and His Envoy'. God in His Essence is transcendent from all creatural qualities. Certainly by virtue of the Uniqueness of the Essence He is transcendent from His Qualities, but the heart of the complete servant is the total place of manifestation of God, and if the servant is pained, consequently God is equally pained. In the above saying: 'those who pain God and His Envoy', the pain caused to the Envoy interprets and explains the Divine pain.

What greater pain is there than when God has inflicted you with suffering at the level of your ignorance of Him, that is to say, at the level of your ignorance of a Divine station, until you complain to God for that affliction to be removed from you and thereby return to Him, and He then removes the affliction from you. Accordingly, your reality which is your indigence, your servanthood, your incapacity, all become real, because indigence is the essential quality of the servant. The affliction is removed from God in consequence of your complaint concerning the removal of that affliction, because you are His manifest image, and you are not the place of recourse for the removal of that affliction. Can there be a greater affliction than the fact that He afflicts you so that you correct your servanthood and know that He is the place of recourse for the removal of the affliction, and that you are not the place of recourse; and you afflict God with the same pain mentioned in the words above.

Certain gnostics were hungry and wept because of this. Someone who had no taste in this science concerning the weeping of the gnostic, reprimanded him, and the gnostic replied: 'God made me hungry so

that I cry to Him', by which he means: 'God afflicted me with an ill so that I ask of Him for the removal of that ill from me, and that asking does not diminish my patience.' In other words, indigence, which is one of the necessities of servanthood, does not diminish my being patient. Therefore, to correct the poverty and servanthood of a true servant, it is necessary to ask and pray.

Now we have come to know that certainly patience is to restrain the soul from complaint to other than God. When the Shaykh mentioned other than God, and when you say that the totality of existence is the manifest image of God, that there is no existence other than God, then how can it be imaginable to complain to other? And he answered: what I mean by 'other' is one particular aspect from among the Divine aspects. In fact God appointed a specific aspect from among the Divine aspects, and that specific face is called the face of Identity (*huwiyyah*). That is to say, it is the aspect of the Absolute Identity, which includes the totality of aspects, and that aspect is the Divine Name. Thus the servant who asks God for the removal of affliction should pray with that aspect and not pray with the other aspects which are called 'causes', even though the other aspects are no other than the face of Identity. That is to say, the aspect of Identity is the same as the totality of aspects, and its particularization in all the aspects is its particularization in Himself. To restrain the soul from complaining to other than God is to incline to a specific aspect of God from among the Divine aspects. For the gnostic to pray to the Being (*huwiyyah*) of God for the removal of ill from himself does not veil him from the fact that the totality of the causes are again the same as God Himself, and there is no difference between the vision of the gnostic and the vision of that aspect of Being; but for other than a gnostic, it is ruled by difference.

What has just been mentioned is a mystery, which path is not applicable to those who are other than people of tact from among the servants of God, because they alone are secure people for God, and are not known to other than God, and only some of those know each other. Thus we have advised you; so act accordingly, and ask of God, the Glorious, so that you correct the servanthood and indigence, and in the desiring of necessary things follow the example of the Divine order.

God says: 'Pray to Me and I will answer you', and God tells the truth and guides on the Way.

The Wisdom of Awesome Majesty
(*al-ḥikmat al-jalâliyyah*)
in the Word of John (Yahya)

THIS is the Wisdom of the primordially in Names, because God called him Yahya (John), that is, so that Zachariah's remembrance (*dhikr*) be alive by it. The Wisdom pertaining to John is of the Names of Primal Wisdom (*al-ḥikmat al-awwaliyyah*). God called John with the name John, meaning thereby that the *dhikr* of Zachariah became alive through this action. Primordially in a name is the qualification through which that name acquires its primal position. In names primordially occurs because when a name is given for the first time to a thing, which then being named by that for the first time, it acquires that primordially. Now God called with the name John a thing which was primary to the humankind, and He did not name with this name only so that Zachariah's *dhikr* should come alive by it, because Zachariah had asked of God: 'Present me from Your private Knowledge (*ladun*) a waliyy, to be my heir and an heir to the House of Jacob, and bring him forth well agreed by the Lord.' That is, he asked for a saintly heir as his heir so that his *dhikr* should come alive through that. **And He had not brought forth before this of that name.** God the High says: 'And We had not brought forth before this of that name' (Quran). Meaning that God says that He did not call before this anything by that same name. Now here, contrary to His custom, God united in this name knowledge and qualification, because when Zachariah asked of God the High for a saintly successor so that he will become his own heir in prophethood and knowledge and that his remembrance of God be alive through him, God agreed to his (Zachariah's) prayer. Thus God called John by the name John because God the High bestowed him to an impotent old man and a barren old woman, and contrary to custom He named him John, because usually the knowledge of a quality and the quality itself are not united in a name, to point at the unusualness of this case, and also for particularization of John and honouring of Zachariah. **And He united between the coming forth of the quality, that which would be remaining and he would leave behind a child by whose**

rememoration (*dhikr*) he would live, and between his name. Because of this He called him Yahya. That is to say, God called John with the name John so as to continue the *baqā'* (existence) of Zachariah's *dhikr*, together with what he was to give up of being a *nabiyy*, with all other things he would have to give up. on the one hand, and on the other hand He was uniting in John the qualification of this name and the knowledge of this qualification. And that his name was John (Yahya) became as though it was a knowledge of taste. Thus John's name became the same for John himself as the taste he had for that knowledge, which means it is known through taste that the name John expresses two benefits that have been mentioned, which are quality and knowledge. For instance, a person who hears of a knowledge, but as his quality is not attuned for that knowledge, that knowledge does not come forth for him unless he has the taste for it. It became for John knowledge of taste, because having been both qualified and called, knowledge resulted in John, and this became, in John, knowledge of taste (*'ilm-udh-dhawqi*). Consequently, it is considered that in John that which is meant is Life, and this consideration is of taste (*dhawqī*) and is not the way of usual people that therein one consider the meaning of what it is derived from in that which is derived. It is true that the rememoration of Adam is alive through Seth, and the rememoration of Noah through Shem, and it is like this for the prophets (S.A.), but God did not unite for any one person before John between the name and its meaning, that is to say, which emanates from it, and between the quality, except for Zachariah as favour from Him, as He says: 'And We gave him from Our private Knowledge (*ladun*) a saintly heir.' And Zachariah gave priority to God over his son, exactly as Asiyah did when she gave priority in her mention of neighbourhood (to God) to the house in her words: 'Close to You a house in Paradise', and God honoured him by destining for him his need and called it by His own Name, *ḥayy*, Life, so that his name becomes rememoration of what His prophet Zachariah asked of Him. It is true that Adam's *dhikr* came alive with Seth, and Noah's rememoration became alive with Shem, and in the same way, the rememoration of the prophets (S.A.) became alive with their successors which were their sons, but God the High did not unite for any one of His prophets between the knowledge and the quality before John, where that name unites between the knowledge which emanates from God, because God the High calls John by the name in His saying: 'I give you good news by a son whose name is John.' This is only for

Zachariah because of the favour which emanated from Him for Zachariah because Zachariah had said: 'Give me from Your private Knowledge a saintly successor', thus giving priority to God over the mention of his son, just as Asiyah had done when she gave priority to the neighbourhood of God in her words: 'Near You a house in Paradise.' Consequently, because Zachariah gave priority to the mention of God over the mention of his son, God favoured him and destined to him his need, that is to say, by giving him John in uniting between qualification and knowledge as a present. And God the High called the son He gave as a gift to Zachariah with the quality which is Life that Zachariah demanded, so that John's name be a rememoration for what Zachariah, His prophet, asked of Him, because Zachariah had asked the continued life of his rememoration. Thus, the name John rememorates that, and the rememoration of Zachariah is alive by him, and calling John by His own Quality. **Because the S.A. (Zachariah) wanted the rememoration of God to remain after him, because the son is the mystery of his father, and said: 'To be heir to me and an heir to the sons of Jacob', but there never is in reality an heir after them (the prophets) except in the station of the rememoration of God and inviting to Him.** Because Zachariah wanted to establish an heir to the rememoration of God to remain after himself, and asked for a son because the son is the mystery of his father. Thus Zachariah said: 'An heir to me and an heir to the people of Jacob.' However, in this matter for the prophets (S.A.) there is no heir except for the rememoration of God and invitation to God. Thus, Zachariah (S.A.) asked for a pure son which would be his mystery, and for the continued remaining of the Divine rememoration and invitation to God which was in himself, so that that son would rememorate God and would invite people to God, because Zachariah (S.A.) was the place of manifestation of *rahmah* and of completion, and he was at the extreme of satisfaction of the subtlety and munificence of beauty and domination and awe and majesty, but at the time of his prayer and asking, his interior was dominated by the fear of the powerful heirs of wrong-doing, so much so that he was afraid that rememoration of God and invitation to God would be lost after him, and he had no saintly heir so that he would have a people over whom he would be present with the order of prophethood, so that he would remember God with true rememoration and invite the people to God. Thus, the asking for a pure son among the prophets is for the perpetuation of the desire of the knowledge of God and the manifestation of

the worship of Ipseity which is completion, and the desire for the perpetuation of all this is because the manifestation of God is through the manifestation of completion, and the prophet's knowledge is continuous and persistent through the completion of his being, and it is equally so for Zachariah (S.A.) whose interior was under the dominion of gift-giving and grandeur and delicacy and fear and humility and sadness and persistence and lack of dispensing (*taşarruf*) and under the desire for the perpetuation of the remembrance of God and under the domination of the fear of being cut away from people, and childlessness, exactly like the state of Mary who was abstinent and cut away. At the level of Zachariah's being given the announcement of a child, Zachariah's act resided in silence and in suspension of mention and speech, except for the remembrance of God. Thus the image of the interior and mystery (of John, his son) was not like that. In him, he was immured with the domination of the determinations of awe and majesty over the determinations of beauty and he was continuous in remembrance and fear of God, so much so that the state of John determined over the state of Zachariah, and the enemies determined over him (Zachariah) with the determinations of destruction and awe like they did determine over John with destruction and awe. **And then He in fact congratulated him by giving primordially to him by His *salâm* to the S.A. on the day of his birth and the day of his death and the day he will be resurrected alive.** And then He announced his (John's—Yahya's) arrival by *salâm* (peace through perfection) upon him, and again *salâm* upon him the day he was born, the day he will die, and the day he will be resurrected alive. Then equally He congratulated Zachariah by giving precedence to John over his equals by qualifying with *salâm* his primordially, his finality, and his resurrection alive. **And He brought with the quality of Life, and that is His Name.** In certain copies it is: and made it known to him by giving *salâm* over him. In short, God, by bringing the qualification of Ipseity in mentioning *ḥayy*, qualified Yahya by it, which qualification became his name. In other words, the name Yahya is derived from Life, or in other words, Life is a Name of God. **And His word is the truth, and it is cut** (any possibility of doubt) **by it.** He made known to Zachariah that He has greeted John by His own Name of Ipseity, and the word of God is truth, and this is *naṣṣ-i-muḥkam* (an uncontradictable definite assertion). The *salâm* of God upon John is at his primacy (birth, beginning, firstness, moment of becoming) and is at his end (day of death), and

his day of resurrection, and equally on the day of the birth of his heart, according to the spiritual *mashî'a* of nature (or equally on the day of the birth of John's heart as it emanates from the general *mashî'a* of human beings) or the birth of John's spiritual emanation from the *mashî'a*, and equally from the day of the death of his *nafs* (self) and again at his becoming existent in the Reality of Truth. The day of his birth equally means the day of his birth in the knowledge of God by the establishment of the image of that knowledge, together with the *ta'ayyun awwal* (or through the *ta'ayyun awwal*—First *ta'ayyun* = First individuation), or equally on the day of his *ta'ayyun* (individuation) according to his natural inclination having received the manifestation of the Name *salâm* from the Most Holy Effusion (*fayḍ-al-aqdas*); and the day of his death is the day when he is released from his *ta'ayyun-i-wujûdî* (individuation in existence), and the third part, where it says 'resurrected alive', means that on the Great Day of Judgement, through the annihilation of all devolutions manifested and secret, and coming into *baqâ'* (remaining) after *fanâ'* (passing away), existing then only through the Being of the Ipseity, thus being resurrected alive through the Divine Life of the Ipseity.

Among all the people of insight (*kashf*) it is agreed that the most complete and most complete perfection—*salâm*—is this, because the word *salâm* refers to God Himself, is a qualification from God Himself, and the words '*salâm* to him' referring to John. And in fact the word of the Spirit (Jesus): '**And *salâm* upon me the day I am born, the day I shall die and the day I shall be resurrected alive**', is the most perfect upon agreement. Having said that this is the most perfect and complete form of *salâm*, people will say then, what is the position of Jesus? How could it be so when the situation is that in the manifestation of Jesus, God announced Jesus' birth by his beginning and his end being in the *salâm*? And the answer is that though this is the most complete form of *salâm* in the case of John, in the case of Jesus, because he is the Spirit of God and the Word of God, it is through the devolution into Jesus of the Substance of God that God gives the *salâm* upon Himself and not upon another, and the immanence of this uniqueness proves Jesus' being established in completeness. That Jesus proclaims himself transcendent from all lack and shortcoming, which transcendence is private to God, establishes that completeness. **And that is the most complete in the consensus of opinion and belief, and the highest for purposes of interpretation.** Thus the *salâm* in the case of

John, where belief and consensus of opinion is concerned, is more complete and is higher placed for interpretations. The reason why it is more complete in the consensus is that God the High gives *salâm* to His own Self which is in the substance of John due to the fact that He is the Lord of John and responsible for the fiding of John. It is perhaps that the *salâm* to him the day he is born, the day he dies and the day he will be resurrected alive, of God the High, is an address and fiding from the Quiddity of the Absolute Ipseity which unites all the Divine aspects. The *salâm* upon Himself is by way of His individuation in the substance of Jesus through a special aspect from among Divine aspects, and a special purpose. Thus, the *salâm* which comes down from the aspect of the Absolute Quiddity which includes and unites all aspects is more complete in the consensus than a *salâm* which emanates from one aspect of the many aspects. The substance of Jesus is one aspect from among the Divine aspects. In the Absolute Quiddity the aspect of Absolute Quiddity is united in the totality of all aspects and it descends from there. However, this *salâm* does not point at the residing of the completion of John in this witnessing of uniqueness because it does not descend from the place of manifestation which is John. And the reason why in belief the *salâm* upon John is more complete and more elevated in interpretation is this, that the *salâm* of God the High upon John is by virtue of His being his Lord, not by virtue of the fact that He is individuated in the substance of John. Perhaps it is by virtue of His Absolute Quiddity. Thus, in relation to the belief of the veiled people, the *salâm* upon John from God the High from His Absolute Quiddity is more complete and more final than the *salâm* of God for Himself who is individuated in the substance of Jesus, or from Jesus' *salâm* to himself, because the *salâm* from God is more agreed to by the people of beliefs, and interpretations arise completely from this in comparison to the interpretations that happen to come about in consideration of God's individuation in the substance of Jesus. Except that in this there is no interpretation. People of belief believe by saying that God's *salâm* to John is the word of God, and the act of *salâm* in the case of John is not an act of similarity that it need interpretation, whereas Jesus' word needs interpretation because he gives *salâm* upon his own self with the tongue of God and with the tongue of supererogatory closeness. Or else, in accordance with the saying: 'In that God speaks in the tongue of His servant', which is the tongue of the closeness of obligations, God the High, through the tongue of

Jesus, gives *salâm* to Himself in consideration of the fact that He is veiled in the individuation of Jesus. In short, if these words are not interpreted, none of the people of belief acknowledge the veracity of the fact that God the High gives *salâm* upon Himself in the substance of Jesus. However, the fiding and *salâm* which is in the place of manifestation which is Jesus is more complete at the level of the people of insight (*kashf*) and gnosis, as it is in relationship to the residing of Jesus in completion and the witnessing of the uniqueness of Jesus, because there is no indication in the case of John in himself to the witnessing of his uniqueness and his residing in completion other than the fiding which has come down to him from the aspect of the Quiddity of God. In fact it is that He went in this matter against the usual custom in the case of Jesus in that he spoke when his intelligence and completion had resided in him at this time when He made him talk therein, and it is not necessary to believe someone who is able to talk in whatever state, because it is possible that he speaks contrary to what is witnessed by him, whereas for John it is the *salâm* of God upon John. It is from this aspect that it is higher, as it happens to be clothed by the Divine Munificence as compared to the *salâm* of Jesus to his own self. In fact, it is that in the case of Jesus the usual custom was deviated from. What happened was that Jesus spoke in the cradle, that is to say that the intelligence of Jesus became established and complete at that time when God the High made Jesus speak therein. It is not necessary to believe the speech of somebody who is capable of speaking in no matter what condition in what he says, that is to say, whether it be by way of making someone speak or making it possible for them to speak, or whether it be that he has the ability to speak, it is not necessary to believe what he is saying. That is to say, the fact that one speaks with a speech does not necessitate the veracity of that speech, because it is possible that he speaks with a speech which is not in concordance with the order itself. The case of John is contrary to this possibility by the fact that he has been witnessed as such, because it is God the High who witnessed with His words where he is concerned. Thus the *salâm* of John in this aspect is higher in clothing, which is the Divine clothing which clothes John, than the *salâm* of Jesus upon his own self. And in fact if the closeness of the state (of Jesus) denotes his closeness to God in this, and his veracity, as well as denoting the blamelessness of his mother when he spoke in the cradle, and this is one of the two witnesses, and the second witness is the shaking of the dry and barren tree, and

fresh and moist (fruit) falling from it without fertilization and without there being a male, just as Mary gave birth to Jesus without intercourse in accordance with the usual manner. Of the two witnesses of Mary's absolution, one is Jesus' speaking in the cradle, or it is Jesus himself, and the second is that God told Mary when Jesus was still in her to shake for herself the dead date tree and there would fall down fresh and moist dates for her. It is at the level of Mary's shaking the dried branch, and that fresh and moist fruit would fall from it is this second witness. In fact, fresh and succulent dates fell down from the date tree contrary to the custom necessary in dates, where it is necessary to fertilize them and bring in male flowers, just as Mary gave birth to Jesus without fertilization or a male, contrary again to the customary intercourse as is necessary and customary for women to bear children. If a prophet said: 'It is my act and my miracle that this wall should speak', and the wall said: 'You lie in your speech, you are not the envoy of God', indeed that prophet's act would be true, and with the speech of the wall it would be established that he was the envoy of God, and no one would pay attention to the fact that the wall said: 'You are a liar and you are not the envoy of God.' These words of the Shaykh refer to what is mentioned before, where it is said the possibility of speech does not necessarily mean that what is said is true. As this possibility may enter in the speech of Jesus due to his mother pointing at him when he is in the cradle, makes the *salâm* upon John higher from this aspect. Thus, if this possibility exists at the level of the veiled ignorant and enters into the words of Jesus which happened consequently to his mother Mary pointing at him when he was in the cradle, then only in this aspect the *salâm* upon John is higher, because such a possibility does not enter the word of God. And the subject which denotes that he is the servant of God from the fact that he said therein, is due to the fact that (they would later on say) he is the son of God, and the denotation became purified by the confirmation of the speech that he is the servant of God with the latter people who are aware of his prophethood, and what there remained in excess (of what he said) as determination of possibility for the intellectual point of view, until the truth of all he notified of in the cradle became true in the future. So (understand) in truth what we have pointed at. The reason why Jesus (S.A.) pointed to the subject of his being the servant of God by the words: 'I am the servant of God', is due to the fact that it was said that Jesus was the son of God, whereas these words are complete and pure indications due to specific speech

because Jesus is the servant of God at the level of latter people who know the quiddity of Jesus, that is to say, they testify to that. What he said other than: 'I am the servant of God', remained as a possibility at the level of the intellectual point of view, until all he had notified of when he was in the cradle became manifest and true in the future when he invited them, which means that other than what he said: 'I am the servant of God', remained in the determination of a possibility from the point of view of the intellectual, until in the future when he was appointed, and when he was appointed his truth became evident and the possibility was eradicated. Thus, you, understand according to the truth that which we have pointed at, that is to say, it has been pointed out to you the difference between the *salâm* of Jesus upon himself and God's *salâm* to John, or that you understand with clear understanding and witness with the discerning vision (*başîrah*) the truth of all he gave news of concerning the abolition of Mary, his mother, and give no substance to the possibility which results from the intellectual point of view.



Of the Wisdom of Ownership (*al-ḥikmat al-mâlikiyyah*) in the Word of Zachariah

KNOW that indeed God's *rahmah* encompasses all things both by being and by determination (*ḥukm*). That is to say, whether a thing is existent by being called existent or whether a thing is existent only in knowledge. Divine Mercy encompasses all existents of possible feelings and knowledgeable individuations and relationships with non-existence. And indeed the existence of anger is also due to God's Mercy upon anger. Thereby, His Mercy passed beyond His Anger, that is to say, the relationship of Mercy to Himself goes beyond the relationship of Anger to Himself. Know it like this, that Mercy is Essential (that is, from the Ipseity) for Truth (*ḥaqq*), because Truth (God) is by Itself existent, and His effusion and goodness emanates from the treasures of the existence of Mercy from the Divine Presences. Consequently, Mercy of Truth encompasses all the individuations of existence and relationship of non-existence ('*adam*'). And anger is also of the relationship of non-existence. And *rahmah* encompasses also anger because the existence of anger is also from Divine Mercy, but the relationship of anger to the Truth is subsequent to the relationship of Mercy to the Truth, because anger, in comparison to Mercy, is contingent; just as to flow is contingent to being water, and equally, as its solidity is contingent to its fluidity. In fact, anger is a determination (*ḥukm*) from non-existence ('*adam*') and takes its origin from the non-ability of an existent to receive and actuate a determination (*ḥukm*) of manifestation, when the '*ayn*' is in completion.

Hence the determination (*ḥukm*) of that thing's inability to receive Mercy would necessitate the complete non-appearance of Mercy in that thing in this world and in the other. Therefore, the thing's inability to receive and the non-reception to the effusion of Mercy is in relationship to the thing itself called by the Merciful: anger, criminality, and badness (*sharr*). Hence, the relationship of Mercy to the Truth goes beyond the relationship of Anger to the Truth. The Manifestation of Mercy, which is the consequence of the Mercy of Light upon the

quality of the *a'yân* (Mercy of Light, *rahmat-i-nûr*, which is to be effused upon the *a'yân* through the manifestation of Mercy in the *a'yân* which have inability to exist), has created nothing but a non-existent relationship, and there is no reality in pure non-existence until Mercy is brought to act upon it. Hence, the Mercy of Truth has become common to all relative non-existences. Therefore, it is Mercy which has created anger, pain, poverty, miserliness, and things of this kind, and encompassed them, because these things have acquired existence due to the fact that they are affirmed as negative. Hence anger, because it is a non-existent relationship, is mercified (*marhûm*), and would never have had existence, and existence is only for the *khayr-i-mahd* and the *rahmat-i-mahd* (complete goodness and complete mercy). But *sharr* is an order to non-existence (*amr 'adamî*) which is complete non-existence (*'adam-i-mahd*), and has no reality until Mercy is attached to it. That is why the Prophet said: 'My God, indeed all goodness is in Your Hands and also badness, whatever that is to You' (*allâhumma inna al khayr kullu biyadayka wa-sh sharr laysa ilayka*). When the order of existence becomes complete goodness (*khayr-i-mahd*), the Mercy of complete goodness brings into existence badness, which is nothing but relative goodness, due to the ability or lack of ability of the *a'yân*. Therefore definitely with respect to bringing into existence or manifesting it, the totality of goodness is in the two Hands of the *haqq*, and in consequence so also is *sharr* which is a complete non-existent; and which also has no relationship to *haqq*, because *haqq* is existence and *sharr* is complete non-existence. Due to the necessities of manifestation, what is meant by *khayr*, when Guidance and Mercy is being effused upon the *a'yân*, is their ability to receive this Mercy and Guidance. Due to the inability of certain of the *a'yân*, this lack of reception is *sharr*. Therefore, this relationship of *sharr* is attributed to the *a'yân* by virtue of their non-ability, and is not attributed to *haqq*.

All order (*amr*) is according to three faces, and one of these faces is the face of complete existence (*wujûd-i-mahd*) which from all eternity and forever does not accept non-existence. The other face is complete possibility which from all eternity and forever receives existence due to a cause. The third face is complete non-existence (*'adam-i-mahd*) which from all eternity and forever does not accept existence. *Wujûd-i-mahd*, complete existence, is *haqq*, the Truth, and no other. The existence of the universes is between complete existence and complete non-existence. Hence, that thing by which the universe looks towards

non-existence, accepts non-existence, and that thing by which the universe looks towards existence, accepts existence. Therefore, some of the universes which are darkness of nature and some of them which are light, are the Divine Ipseity, *nafs ilâhî* (Divine *nafs*). Hence, in relation to light, darkness is bad, but existence by virtue of its being existence is goodness, while badness is complete non-existence. Oh student! That is to say, when there was an existence for each '*ayn*', be it an '*ayn*' of existence or an '*ayn*' of knowledge, which is the '*ayn-i-thâbita*' of each thing, that '*ayn*' demands its existence from God individuated in the degree of Divinity, and from the Presences of the Names and from the treasury of the Name which is particular to it. Because God always extends and grants the existence which is the due to that '*ayn*', and each '*ayn*' would not have causality of qualification had it not been so, and that is why the Mercy of God became common to each thing, because God, through that Mercy through which He gave Mercy to each thing and by bringing it into existence in the existence of knowledge, accepted by that its demand and its closeness which is in the existence of its '*ayn*' and the closeness which is in you. In other words, God brought into existence the '*ayn*' of that thing. That is, God in His Knowledge with a special Mercy establishes that thing with the existence of its '*ayn*', and when that thing which is thus established demands, requires, or is inclined to closeness and is inclined to existence, God, through that Essential Mercy with which in the Presence of Knowledge He had given it *rahmah* and brought it into existence, accepts its desire for closeness which is in the '*ayn*' of existence of that thing, and brought into existence the '*ayn*' of that thing with that. That is to say, each of the *a'yân*, which were in annihilation in the Ipseity of *haqq*, requested or demanded the coming into existence of their '*ayn*' through their essential inclinations. That is, when they were still non-individuated in the *a'yân*, but all the same were established in the Presence of Knowledge wherein they were individuated and also individuated by the Mercy of God and His Essential revelation in the Presence of Knowledge, then God, with that same Essential Mercy with which He had extracted them from annihilation and had mercified them, now accepted their closeness and inclination to coming into existence in their '*ayn*' and accepted their request and brought them into existence.

Hence because of this, that is to say, after the *a'yân* were established in the Divine Knowledge, through the *rahmah* of Ipseity, they became

demanding of becoming an *'ayn* because God with the same Mercy had given them existence in the being of *'ayn*. And we had said before, that in fact God's Mercy had covered everything in being and in knowledge, that is to say, whether a thing is in being through its *'ayn*, or whether that thing is in being in the being of knowledge. While the *a'yân-i-thâbita* were still in annihilation in the Ipseity of *ḥaqq* and in the collectivity of the *nafs-i-raḥmânî*, the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* and the *raḥmat-i-subḥânî* liberated them from the constriction of non-existence; and by a stroke from the existence of the Presence of Knowledge which is the existence of establishment (*wujûd-i-thubût*) God gave them existence and gave them ability of existential revelation or self-revelation, which ability accepts, receives, their inclination to closeness to the existence of *'ayn* through the essential talent or propensity, and gives them existence through His Mercy in the existence of *'ayn*. Hence the first effect of the Essential Mercy in that *'ayn* is the permission for it to receive existence which is called talent or propensity. Hence, God mercified the *'ayn* from the *fayd-al-aqdas* before its propensity or talent for existence, which is tantamount to being the same as the revelation of the essential *'ayn* by giving it propensity. And that propensity is the Mercy of God to it, both through knowledge and determination (*ḥukm*), because in being, it has no existence. After that, through the propensity of demanding of the *a'yân* and the asking by Mercy in the *ghayb*, He gave them existence through the existence of *'ayn*, and this giving of existence is the *ḥaqq*'s existence of Mercy upon them.

The Divine Names of God are of 'things' (*ashyâ'i*) by being in opposition to the Ipseity of Uniqueness. Nevertheless, the Divine Names are all in reference to the Oneness of *'ayn*, which is the Reality of the Name *raḥmân*. That is, the first thing which the *raḥmah* of God has encompassed is the same thing as that *'ayn* which brings into existence the Mercy of the Names through the Mercy of the Ipseity, because the Mercy of the Names becomes realized through that *'ayn*. When the Shaykh al-Akbar said before that Mercy encompasses all the things and that Divine Names are of things, he meant that the Essential *raḥmah* (*raḥmah* of Ipseity) has effused *raḥmah* upon the Divine Names because of the reality of the Names, which become differentiated through the Names of Ipseity. And where each is separated from the other in opposition, or in differentiation from the Ipseity, they are 'things'. Hence, the *a'yân* of the Names all refer to one *'ayn*,

which is the Reality of the Name *rahmân*, because the 'ayn of the Reality of the Name *rahmân* refers to the one 'ayn, because the One, which is the Reality of the Name *rahmân*, includes all the Names of the *a'yân*. Therefore, that first 'thing' which was encompassed by the *fayḍ-al-aqdas*, which is the manifestation of the Ipseity with the Essential Mercy, that 'thing' is the 'thingness' of the collectivity of 'ayn. That 'ayn is the Reality of the source of Mercy which is then differentiated into the Mercy of the Names, and that 'ayn is mercified and brought into existence by the Mercy of the Ipseity to become Names of Mercy and to bring into existence the Names of Mercy through the Essential Mercy of the Ipseity. In that case, that which encompassed the first thing with the Mercy of Ipseity is the *nafs-i-rahmah*, the Mercy Itself. That is, that which became manifested in the 'ayn of Mercy, is Mercy, because in the relativity of non-existence, even *rahmah* does not manifest except in an 'ayn. Therefore, according to the first face, Mercy encompasses the 'thingness' of that 'ayn, which makes it Merciful to its own Mercy. Because in manifesting, that 'ayn becomes the event of the Ipseity of Mercy, consequently, if Mercy is mercifying, it is mercifying its own *nafs*. Consequently, that thing is its own thingness. That is to say, the thingness of the 'ayn of Oneness. And is the beginning and origin of all the *a'yân*, and is also, consequently, the thingness of all existence, which means the existence of their thingness. In other words, concisely, it means that first of all *rahmah* is encompassing to its own *nafs* and then encompasses the 'ayn of Oneness, which includes all the Names of the *a'yân*, that is, the Reality of the Name of *rahmân*. In short, the *nafs-ar-rahmân* is encompassing before and after the manifestation of all things. However, though it has encompassed everything, Mercy is also a relationship from the relationship of non-existence and is a thing among things. But because He says His *rahmah* encompasses everything, therefore in His Knowledge that becomes real through His Knowledge and by existence. Whereas many things are seen as under Anger, though all things are mercified, then nothing ought to be under Anger. Yet the Mercy of the Essential Mercifulness of completeness (*kamâl*) is subjected to the common Mercy of Mercifulness by virtue of the place of receptivity. And we have already mentioned in the *Futûhât* that indeed effect does not take place except for the non-existent, and does not take place for that which exists. That is to say, effect is established for the *a'yân-i-thâbita* which are non-existent, and is effective

in the existence of *ḥaqq*. But effect is not for *ḥaqq* Itself. What is necessary for *ḥaqq* is only the effusion of existence, with relation to the *a'yân*, and not the changing in any way of the *a'yân*. And whereas the effect is established for the existent, it is thus by consideration of the order of non-existence. That is to say, it is established by the order of the non-existence upon the existence, because the non-existence gives order over the existence through its non-existentness, so that gives it existence, and the existence equally becomes effected by the non-existence and inclines to give it existence. That is to say, effect first appears in the existent for the non-existent, and then after that becomes established in the existent through the order and necessities of the non-existent. That is to say, the *a'yân* which are established in the Divine Knowledge are non-existent in the *anfus*, and the existence which encompasses them through the manifestation of existence has effect on the Oneness of Truth through the particularities of their essences and by limiting, individuating, inclining and calling it by Names, so much so that Divine Names and Divine relationships become manifested with respect to them. And the Divine relationship by virtue of being non-existent of *a'yân*, their realization does not exist, because their reality cannot be intellectually possible except between two orders, the orders of existence and non-existence. And existence is only one side of this and that side is *ḥaqq*, and in the existence of things there is no other effected except the things. Therefore, the totality of effects, if they are of Divine Names, they are Names of relationships of non-existence, and if they are individuated from the Ipseity which is individuated by a Name, they are from existence, by virtue of this relationship which is a relationship of non-existence of *a'yân* and by virtue again of the relationship of individuation of relationship and of essential individuations. And if the effects of existence in the *ḥaqq* are from the *a'yân-thâbita*, then the effect is for that thing which is non-existent of *'ayn*. And in the immanence, it is also like this, because each effect is manifested from an existent and it is not relatable to the existence of that thing by being its existence, but by the relationship of its non-existence of *'ayn*. Or equally, that which is individuated by a non-existent relationship is the one to whose existence it is related. The Shaykh says that this knowledge is a strange knowledge in the extreme of strangeness, and the aim is in its strangeness and the rarity of its problem. The rarity of the aim and its reality is not understandable except by the people of *awhâm*, which

means people who have gone beyond the world of senses, that is to say, the reality of the problem of the effect of the non-existent on the existent is not understood except by the people of *awhâm* who conjecture certain matters of their own conjecturing which have no existence, and their *nafs* become acted upon and affected by a great action and a very strong effect. That is to say, this knowledge happens in their case through taste; that is to say, they look upon the source of the effect, the source of which are matters of *wahm*, and because of this taste, it so happens a knowledge results in them, and that which has effect on them are matters of *wahm* and non-existence. But that person in whom *wahm* is not effective and is not knowledgeable through taste, that person in whose existence the *wahm* which is an order of non-existence, has so much effect on him, that the person is far from realizing this problem. That is to say, if one told a person who is affected by *wahm* that the *a'yân* of non-existence are effective and ordering in the *amr* of existence, he will by taste understand and comprehend through seeing in his existence the act of the order of *wahm*, and understand how and in what manner the order of non-existence has effect on the existent, but the person who has not felt the effect of *wahm*, cannot understand, because he has not seen the effect of *wahm* in his own self, and he has no pleasure in this question. Another way is as follows: that *wahm*, which is an order of non-existence, appears in the power of imagination of the people of *wahm*, brings into existence things of *wahm* non-existent in the power of imagination. That is, people of *wahm* bring about the existence of things in their imagination, those things which are things of non-existence. That man knows how the *amrs* of non-existence, which are the *a'yân*, have effected in the existence of *ḥaqq*, in His (*ḥaqq*'s) Presence of Knowledge, and brought into existence the images of knowledge which are non-existent in His Presence of Knowledge. And that person in whom *wahm* is not effective, that is to say, who does not create in his faculty of imagination, images of imagination, that person is far from understanding this question.

The Mercy of God, which at the degree of Uniqueness is the same as the Ipseity, is different to It in the degree of Unity and by appearing in manifestation in the images of immanence; *nafs-ar-rahmân* is current in the immanence and in the same way it is current in the *a'yân* of knowledge and in the essences of the unknown by having brought into existence in the Presence of Knowledge the essences and *a'yân* of

the non-existent knowledges. Hence, *rahmah* of the *rahmâniyyah* (the Mercy of the Most Mercifulness) is current in all and every bit of the *a'yân* of the immanence and in the Ipseity of *haqq* and it is the same as the Uniqueness. Hence, since the images of creation and things of knowledge are brought into existence, the Divine Ipseity becomes hidden in them, and it is the place of high degree and the elevated place of descent and it is here to mean *afḍal* (the greatest bounty), which means that if the high degree of the symbolized *rahmah* was discernible through the senses, it would be in a higher degree than thoughts about them.

Whichever person *rahmah* has mentioned (*dhikred*, remembered), in fact that person becomes *sa'id*, happy, by the happiness of existence, though there is nothing in existence except that which *rahmah* mentions; the mention by *rahmah* of the things is the same as Its bringing them into existence. Therefore, all existents are mercified by the Mercy of Existence. And to refute the existence of people of ill and suffering in the other world, the Shaykh says: 'Oh my dear friend, do not be veiled from understanding what we have mentioned to you by seeing the pain inflicted in this world by the people of ill, and equally do not be veiled by the existence of the people in pain in the next world, for whom the punishment is reserved, while at the same time you are a believer in the creation of the world, and say or think: "How can one imagine that Mercy is common to everything when in this world there are people of ill, and in the next world, people of suffering?" You remember and know in fact, that *rahmah* is common to all things in existence, and that all of *rahmah* is in the bringing into existence of *a'yân* of the unknown and *a'yân* of immanence, and one of all the *a'yân* is pain, because pain exists, is brought into existence by the Mercy of Truth upon pain': and after that know for certain that for *rahmah*, effect is in two ways. One of these ways or faces is to effect directly, and the direct effect of *rahmah* is bringing to existence of all that is existent, and it is observant of the *a'yân*, (themselvesness of the things brought into existence), who in their turn have received their existence from *haqq*.

In fact, *rahmah* observes all existents and establishes their *a'yân* in the Divine Knowledge in the same strength as the belief of their *a'yân thâbita* in the *rahmah*, and the *a'yân thâbita* has seen the *haqq* which is existent in the creature and in that which is brought into existence, because the believing *haqq*, Itself, is one state (*ḥâl*) of the states of the

believing *a'yân*. The *rahmah* of *haqq*, Mercy of Truth, has mercified the *makhluq* (creature, the created) by virtue of It mercifying Itself by bringing them into existence, which makes that He Himself is the first mercified of all the creatures of the Mercy. Because the bringing into existence of the *a'yân thâbita*, by the *rahmah*, by appertenance to belief, is the same as the appertenance of Truth to the created; and the other effect for *rahmah* results through the question; that is to say, it is degreed according to the degrees of questions. Those who are veiled question the *haqq* or demand of the *haqq* that He has mercy on them. But *ahl-i-kashf*, people of vision, demand the Mercy of God which exists through them. And they require, demand, ask God's Mercy through the Name *Allâh*. And they say: 'Oh *Allâh*, mercify us', and the *rahmah* does not mercify them in any other way than through their *qayyûmness* (Permanently Subsistent) because *rahmah* is only subsistent by them. Hence, for any place, the order is established because for each Quality or Adjective which exists through the existence of the recipient place, that place happens in the order of that Quality. The qualified establishes the Quality. Because in reality an order is established only for the subsistence of that place where the order is received. For example, like the spirit which can exist only by the body, and the spirit is the order upon that body (in control of it), but it is not there if the body is not there, and does not have order over the body after it has left the body, with the exception, however, of the complete *kâmil* spirit, which unlike what is mentioned above, does not manifest in a special form, except temporarily, and does not really hold a form. Therefore, the meaning which subsists through a place is Merciful through its reality. And that person through whose existence *rahmah* is perpetuated is not called the Merciful, but is called by the meaning that perpetuates the *rahmah* in him. Except that that person is called by the meaning of the *rahmah* which is perpetuated by his being. In reality, the thing that orders is the meaning of Mercy. People of *kashf* observe through taste in their own *nafs* the order of the *rahmah* which is subsistent through their being, because *rahmah* is *thâbita*, established, in their existence. It is exactly, clearly, like the spirit for which they are the mould. In the same way as *rahmah* is subsistent by them, they are subsistent by the *rahmah*, and they observe in their existence, through taste, that the order under which they are is Mercy. In the same way, *rahmah* is not created by being in the creature, because like the spirit, it persists in the creature, but also like the spirit, their place

is under the order of that spirit. In the same way, *rahmah* is not immanenced except by the presence of the existent, though it is not the same as that which is immanenced. The order of *rahmah* which causes the subsistence of its effect, cannot be called creature, because the order is an *amr*, an order of God, that is, it does not become immanenced.

Therefore, states are non-existent, equally they are not non-existent. That is to say, for states, existence is not a manifested *'ayn*, because states are relationships and the relationship is a non-existent order, *amr* of *'adam*; in the exterior existence it has no existence. Equally, it is not non-existent in the states of orders; for example, the man who is knowledgeable, that is to say, the man through whom knowledge is existent, is called the knower and his being a knower is his state. Therefore, a person who is a knower is qualified by knowledge, but that knowing person is not the same bodily as that person. Equally, that person is not the same as the knowledge. For the knower, the fact of being knowledgeable is a state for that person. He is only qualified by the meaning of knowledgeableness and that is why the person who is knowledgeable is called the knower. And in reality, *rahmah* from the side of *râhim* (*rahmah*-maker) is a relationship. And *rahmah*, for the person who is the giver of *rahmah*, who is qualified by *rahmah*, is the relationship which necessitates the order; hence this is *rahmah*. Because the merciful, because he is existent, has become merciful through the Mercy of the Compassionate, and when he reaches the level of completion which is suitable to that, he is merciful by the *rahmah* of the Merciful. For that existent, it is not possible to receive this quality after he has reached completion, except when and after the servant is qualified by the Quality of his Lord, and is merciful by that and then is the *rahmah*-giver (*râhim*), and this is because the transitive qualities, when they appear in a person, require the manifestation of the action of that Quality. For example, if God qualifies one of His servants by *qudrah* (ability to do—power), which is *qadr*, and reveals (*tajalli*) Himself to him through that Name, the opening up of miracles and extraordinariness of usages appears in that person, and *rahmah* is the origin of all the Qualities of action, simply because all the *a'yân* of the Qualities of action are brought into existence through *rahmah*. And thus it is established through these and other considerations that *rahmah* is the same as the *haqq*; that is to say that it is the same as the Ipseity of *haqq*, and it is not an added thing unto the Ipseity, and that *haqq*, through the Mercy of Its Ipseity, merciful the Qualities of

Mercy and brought them into existence, and equally through His Mercy, mercified that *'ayn* which perpetuates, subsists, that Mercy until that *'ayn* mercifies all things, and that person who has not tasted this order, that is to say, he did not know through his taste that *rahmah* subsisted through his own being, and equally he did not see established in this order its primordially, hence that person who could not dare to say that *haqq* is the same as the *rahmah* or the same as that Quality, that person is an Ash'ari.

Although *rahmah* is in the degree of collectiveness by virtue of Divinity, because *rahmahs* are the treasures of the Names by virtue of the Names having been collected in It, and that that degree includes all the Divine Names, yet *rahmah* in its relationship to each of the Divine Names is different, because each Name by its own reality is different and distinct from the others, yet each of the Divine Names is the treasury of a kind of *rahmah*, and mercifies the person through that much of the Reality which has been given to him.

It is because of these differences of the degrees of *rahmah* that God is asked to give Mercy upon them. And He does that through each of the Names of Divine Names, and asks for this *rahmah* through those Names, and then God does *rahmah* on the person who demands. And they say when they are asking directly for the *rahmah* of God, which includes all Reality, by remembering the quote in which God Himself says that His *rahmah* encompasses everything, and through the saying: 'Our Lord encompasses everything through the *rahmah* and knowledge.'

The Shaykh al-Akbar describes two ways of flowing. One is the flowing of the people who are believers of religion and who go through certain forms of this and demand *rahmah* on their action; and the other way is without any action being there, that is prescribed, and that way goes through the phrase: 'And My *rahmah* has encompassed all things' and profits from that, and this *rahmah* is the *rahmah* of Ipseity which covers all things, and acts are not in this consideration. And it was because of this way of running that it was said to the Prophet: 'May God forgive you all your sins which are in the past and which will be in the future.' And this is like the Mercy of God again common to everything, and also the case for certain of His servants, to whom He says: 'Do whatever you want, for your forgiveness is already established.' And this second way is called the *rahmah* of *imtinân*, and it is the *rahmah* of the ipseity, and it is not given against

works done for Him. It is from the Ipseity because it covers everything. The *rahmah* which is mentioned in the phrase: 'My *rahmah* has encompassed everything' refers to the *rahmah* of Ipseity, and in the phrase: 'Do what you want, for your forgiveness is already established', this also refers to the *rahmah* of *imtinân*, but in the second case it is private and is not the general *rahmah*. And this address is to such a person who has gone beyond the limitations of human qualifications and in whom the image of God is established. And because he is established there, he is established through the Divine Qualities and therefore is not allowed any more to return to the human qualities. And it is said to him: 'Do whatever you want, because what you do is My action because I have covered and protected your existence with My Qualities, and your existence is assimilated in My existence, and whatever action emanates from you, emanates from Me, because your *huwiyyah* is My *huwiyyah*.'

Therefore, know what I have just told you and do not be ignorant of this; and God is the *waliyy*, the Helper and the Knower.

Of the Wisdom of Intimacy (*al-hikmat al-inâsiyyah*) in the Word of Elijah

ELIJAH (Elias) is Enoch (Idris) who was a *nabiyy* before Noah, and whom God elevated to a high place. Enoch stayed in the heart of the skies (seven spheres, of which the heart is the sun). After that he was sent to Baalbek as an envoy. This is how Enoch is before Noah: Enoch is the grandfather of Noah's father; Noah, son of Lamech, son of Methuselah, son of Enoch; and Enoch is Idris, called Idris because of the multitude of his learning, teaching and writing. (Note: the word Idris comes from the Arabic root *d-r-s*; the same root gives *dars*, which means lesson or learning. *Idrîs* is a superlative form derived from the same root.) Elias (Elijah) is of two beginnings. Death here has no effect, just as in the case of Khidr and Jesus. And God elevated him to the fourth heaven which is the heart of the heavens, that is, the heaven of the sun. Then God brought him down, just as He is going to bring down Jesus, peace be on him, and sent him to Baalbek to be an envoy for a second time. Enoch, peace be on him, had no sexual desire in him. He was pure intellect, and with that intellect he used to solve the mysteries of cosmology, mathematics and Divine sciences; and Enoch had texts concerning these things.

Because of the excessiveness of his asceticism and because the spirituality conquered his other feelings, he was taken up to the fourth sphere—the place of the *qutb*. And after a while he was brought down to Baalbek as an envoy. That is to say, he was the same person known in his first appearance as Enoch (Idris) and in the second appearance as Elijah. Baal is the name of an idol and Bek is the ruler of that place, and Baal was an idol particular to this ruler.

Elijah, who is Idris, was given a vision of an eruption of the mountain called Lebanon from whence appeared to him a horse made of fire (the word Lebanon, *lubnân*, comes from the word *lubânah* which means necessity); and Idris saw this in the '*âlam-i-mithâl* (universe of analogies, dreams, prototypes). In fact what Elijah saw in the '*âlam-i-mithâl* was that in the land of Damascus there was a mountain that

appeared to be like Mount Lebanon and there was an eruption of fire from this mountain and the eruption was in the shape of a horse, all the parts of which were of fire. When Elijah saw this horse, he rode upon it, and whatever was left in him of carnal appetite dropped off him and Elijah became pure intellect without carnality, which was consequent to there being no connection in him with any of the limitations or faults of the *nafs*, like the desires and other qualifications of the *nafs* like pride, envy or anger.

Now know this, that the mountain which is known as Lebanon is the image of the corporeality of Elijah—the body which is necessary for the completion of the spirit in Man. And necessity (*lubânah*) culminates in that, and the eruption of the mountain is the image of the intellectual discrimination between the higher and nobler aspects from the lower and less noble of the realities of power of corporeality. And the image of the horse is the vehicle of the *nafs-i-nâṭiqa* (speaking *nafs*) in the high and Divine *barzakh* and in the degrees of spirituality in the other world. This image is at the same time the image of the spirituality resulting in the corporeality of Elijah due to his excess of asceticism and perseverance together with the completion of the powers of spirituality and qualities and character of the Divine, and together with his accomplishment or completion of the sciences and knowledge.

The fact that the image of the horse appears as of fire is the image of the temperature, the heat, of his pleasure and demand of the Holy Spiritual station (*maqâm*) and the higher degrees of Light; and the burning away is the image of the burning away of the remainder of the powers of desire which prevent complete harmony (*insilâh*) and sanctification.

The coming out of the horse from the mountain is the image of his spiritual completion, and being born twice is to show, in image, the complete separation from the qualities of being born from a mother, like the first emerging out of the mother's womb when the body is completed therein and separates. And again, that it should be of fire, shows the images of completion of nature and inclinations. And this is arrived at by the domination of all those by the heart, which is the *nafs-i-nâṭiqa*, and Intellect (*‘aql*) which is the Holy Light. And the riding of Elijah on that horse is the image of the detachment of the powers of natural desires from the body, and what is left over from the *nafs-i-nâṭiqa*, and through that spiritual image reaching to higher

levels of *insilâh* (harmony). In short, through excessive asceticism, Elijah's spiritual powers conquered his bodily powers. And this conquering completely of the powers of the *nafs* and body has unveiled completely, in the *'âlam-i-mithâl*, his spiritual image. In short, his bodily *nafs* was shown to him in the shape of Mount Lebanon, and his spiritual image is that which resulted from his corporeality, which, in the shape of a horse, went out of him and the mountain split away from him. Just as in the case of the prophet Salih's she-camel, the rock split.

In short, he remained after this vision in the *'âlam-i-mithâl*, completely devoid of any desires, exactly as spirits would be, as in the case of angels, other spirit beings and intelligences. That is to say, he remained manifested in the knowledge of transcendence (*tanzîh*), exactly as the angels, other spirits and intelligences. Hence in Elijah, Truth became transcended completely from qualities of *khalq* and *nafs*. Having transcended all relationships of the body, which is the place of determinations (*hukm*), the result is that Elijah was established according to the half of the knowledge of the Divine as pure intelligence; and that knowledge is complete transcendence; and the completeness of *khalq*, creation, and *nafs*, which carry qualifications of relativity (lacks), were completely erased from him, and he became veiled from complete self-subordination (*tawakkul*) and patience and gratitude and all the qualities appertaining to the *khalq*, and the knowledge of existence and witnessing (*muḥshâhadah*), all of which happens in the images of immanence which is the other half. That is to say, the determinations of the Name *bâṭin* (Hidden) became complete in him, but the determinations of the *ism-i-zâhir* remained, because had intellect (*'aql*) been purely individualized by itself, by virtue of the fact that it takes knowledge from the intellectual vision, its knowledge by God would be according to transcendence and would not be according to immanence (*tashbîh*). Because pure intellect is qualified by the quality of transcendence (*'anzîh*), therefore its knowledge of God is through *tanzîh*. Hence it would be according to one half of the knowledge, because by transcending transcendence from immanence, it is not gnostic of immanence.

If God were to have given gnosis to the intellect through *tajalli*, it would be according to absoluteness, in which case it would not be transcendent according to the vision of the intellect and neither would it be according to immanence. By and in God, his gnosis would be

complete, because he would be observing the Truth in Its flowing in all the images, but knowledge through revelation is not bound by the observing of the Truth (*ḥaqq*). Thus intelligence in the place of *tanzîh* (transcendence) does the transcending with the reality of transcendence and does not do transcending through formal transcendence, and in the places of immanence, it immanences through the immanencing by observation and insight (*kashf*) and observes the flowing of the *ḥaqq* in the images of Nature and the images of species, and because of this, there does not remain a remaining image; except that he sees the reality of that image as the same as the Truth. That is to say, he sees nothing outside of the existence of God until he transcends God from that, and does not establish anything other than the existence of Truth, until through his *wahm* (power of conjecture) he has immanenced it. The point being that he does not transcend or immanence by his own *nafs*, but transcends in the place where the Truth transcends Itself and immanences in the place where the Truth immanences Itself. This knowledge is that complete knowledge which from God has been descended through religions, and through this, knowledge has determined all of *wahm*. That is to say, among the believers and those who imitate and people who are of the power of *wahm*, are all determined by this knowledge because *wahm* goes beyond the necessities of thought and is not subjected to the actions of the intelligence because of the limits imposed by the intelligence, so that he may through such actions take God out of Absoluteness. That is to say, *wahm* determines the Absolute through limitation and determines upon the limited through the Absolute and does not see this determination as impossible, and sometimes determines the unknown by its vision, and sometimes determines its vision by the unknown. Whereas the religions that have been brought down have been brought by the necessity of transcendence and immanence, yet in them no excess of one or other is possible. What they have as possibility is immanence in the transcendence and transcendence in the immanence, and these religious beliefs are in the combination of the two. It is because of the super-dominance of the *wahm* on the intellect in all human beings, that they cannot prevent the *wahm* determining what they have reached by intelligence, their being unable to take away limitations and lacks from what they have understood; *wahm* is the complete veiler and it is because of the determination of the *wahm* that religions came about. That is to say, in this emergence of

humanity and in the completion of the image, the complete determination of *wahm* caused the Divine religions to come about, and not the reverse—that religions cause the *awhâm* to come about.

Therefore, religions immanenced and they transcended, and in their transcendence they immanenced through the ability of conjecture (*tawahhum*). That is to say, because of the ability of conjecture of those who conjecture, immanence is included in the transcendence, and in the immanence it transcended through intellect because intellect is transcendent. Hence all relationships of *wahm* became attached to all relationships of intelligence, and vice versa. In other words, the totality of transcendence becomes attached to the totality of immanence, and the totality of immanence becomes attached to the totality of transcendence. It is impossible that transcendence should be devoid of immanence according to the necessity of *wahm*, equally that immanence be devoid of transcendence. That is why God said of intelligence: '*Laysa kamithlihu shay'un*', which means, there is no thing equal to it. Hence He transcended it, and in transcending, immanenced it by saying: 'There is no thing like unto it', and it creates an example for the *haqq* because it transcends that which is like *haqq* from being equal to anything that is like it, and this is complete transcendence because establishing is likening it to something and it is denying its possibility of being like something. That is, it transcends it in such a way that no thing from among things equals that which is transcended. And this transcendence is also immanence, but it is immanence through conjecture.

Hence, when this decision is determined by saying that indeed God created Adam in His image, because it transcends Adam who is in His own image from being like anything else, according to the high and first way of transcending *haqq* from an example, and what results is that in transcendence there is immanence, and in immanence, transcendence. Just as when He says: 'And He is the Hearer and the Seer.' Hence he immanenced Him because he establishes the two Qualities, which are Qualities established for the servant, for the Truth, and this immanencing is complete transcendence, because He, by saying those two Qualities, specialized these two Qualities for the Truth, and constructed the sentence in such a way that the thing that is hearing and seeing is only the Truth Itself. It is the Unity of the Truth Itself and that there is no hearer or seer except Him and this is transcendence through intellect, and this is the most important of the

sayings concerning transcendence, but with all that it is not free of immanence.

Then He said: '*Subhâna rabbika rabbi-l 'izzati 'ammâ yaşîfûn*' (Glory and grace to your Lord from that which they qualify Him with), and immanenced the Lord from the qualifications attributed to Him by the creatures, but in reality the creatures cannot qualify Him except by that which their intelligences give them to qualify with. That is to say. It can be transcended from the limitation of the human vision and the powers of estimation and the qualities attributable through the intelligence, but cannot be transcended from estimations of *hayûlâ* and necessity of possibility and inclinations of qualities which are received in the heart which is the recipient of Divine revelation, and the gifts of the Ipseity and the gifts of the Names. So what He did is to transcend the Ipseity from the ability of the creatures to transcend Him. Because their ability to transcend limits the Truth, because when they transcend Him they say there is nothing like Him and He is not like any body or form. This kind of transcendence is really limitation; it is transcending by limiting Him from things. Yet for the Reality, any limitation is forbidden. That is to say, in short, God transcended His own Ipseity from the transcending of the people of transcendence, and said that their ability to transcend is through the intelligence and seeing relationships, and this results from the fact that people of intelligence are unable to know, understand, the Ipseity of God according to God's own transcendence from His Ipseity. God alone knows His own transcendence from His own Ipseity.

Then all religions come through that thing which *awhâm* determine. That is to say, through transcendence and immanence. That is to say, the religions did not take away from the Truth any one Quality in which Quality God did not appear. It is true that Reality is apparent, manifested with every Quality, and the religions do not take away from Him any of these Qualities. That is to say that the religions do not say that God manifests not in such and such a Quality and this is exactly immanence, because a religion did not arrive except to express what the Ipseity accepted to manifest in any given degree. And the determinations of the non-manifest did not appear in any degree of the manifestation except through one Quality from among the Qualities, and religions did not come to give news of the Ipseity except through that which concerns that Quality. Religions spoke like this and brought like this; that is to say, religions came according to

the necessities of the determinations of *awhâm*, and what is meant by this is the position of the Truth coming down through a kind of *khayâl*, imagination, close to *wahm*. That is to say, it became knowledgeable according to the necessity of the leaders of *wahm*. That is to say, God granted revelation with the Quality that necessitated immanence to leaders from amongst His servants who are complete, because they were already in visual knowledge of the *amr*, as it was. That is to say, these leaders became heirs to the envoys that followed through *tawhîd* (Unification) between immanence and transcendence, and they did not reach this place through gains of work. In other words, these complete people, the leaders, became communicative with the things that the envoys were communicative with, but the envoy became communicative with that thing through which the *awhâm* determined. That is to say that religions and the envoys being communicative through that which the *awhâm* determined, the complete leaders also are determined by the *awhâm*, and in this saying both *tanzîh* and *tashbîh* are included and this is according to the saying: '*Wa idhâ jâ'athum âyatun, qâlû lan nû'min hatta nû'ti mithl mâ ûtiya rasûl-Allâh Allâhu â'lamu haytha yaj'alu risâlatihi*' ('And if they were shown a miracle they said: we will not believe it until we are given like what was given to the prophet of God. God knoweth best where to place His miracles/message'): where God starts with mention of the envoy of God and after that makes that sentence carry the word *Allâh*. Here God becomes the *huwiyyah* of the envoy and the envoy becomes the image of God, and through this consideration God is the envoy of God, through God being his ipseity and his being His image. But if so, God has placed the ipseity of the envoy of God where His own Ipseity should be. And this sentence thereby becomes a complete representation of immanencing in transcendence through *wahm*. And it is strange among the texts of the leaders not one of them refers to this. Whichever face of the meaning one wants to draw from this sentence, the truth is there, and whoever understands the reality of this, will understand the reality of: 'He who rebels against an envoy, rebels against God.' Hence under these considerations, the immanence which is in the envoy is established for the transcendence which is in the Ipseity of Truth, and the transcendence which is in the Ipseity of Truth is established for the immanence in the envoy.

And also, let this be clear, if God, *haqq*, manifested Himself in one image, He has appeared in that image according to the determination

of that inclination, in which case that image is its place of mirroring. In other words, *haqq* which reveals Itself in any image is manifested under the determination of that talent or inclination. Therefore, if somebody sees God in his dream, that person cannot deny seeing God in that dream, because God in that dream has appeared according to the necessity of the determination of that place where it is reflected. And if a person interprets a dream for that person, he cannot deny that what was seen was God, according to the determination of the place where it was reflected. However, he will never limit or condition God to that one place of reflection, because wherever the vision rests, that again, determined by the inclination of the place wherein the revelation has happened, is again the same God. Therefore he will not limit God to any one form or belief.

But what happens is that quality which is ascribed to that place of reflection is also ascribed to God, and if He wants, He is not manifested in any way, and the man also knows that no matter in what place of reflection or whatever state, whether *zâhir* or *bâtin*, He is transcendent from all of these, and He is not conditioned either by withdrawal or inclination or by Absolute or non-Absolute, or in any possible way.

The word God, by its reality, collects together that degree of totality which is Divinity, and this is no other than the individuated existent creation which is the collectivity of their reality with the collectivity of the active Divine Names and the receptive manifested possibilities which receive those actions; and its manifestation in any one image of the possibilities of the Divine images is not precedent to any other manifestation in a different image. And you cannot transcend Him from one place of revelation or another, because there is not an image outside that which He has encompassed completely from which you could transcend Him; and there is no existent other than the existence of Him by which you can immanence Him. That degree of totality includes all transcendence and immanence, all *zâhir* and *bâtin*, all *haqq* and *khalq*, and at the same time, His Ipseity is *ghaniyy*, Rich beyond Need, of all these. Hence, He is revealed and manifest in every image of all the Divine and immanent images; but the prophets who are qualified by the Divine image and who are realized in that degree of Divinity which is that of the *insân-i-kâmil*, are the Viceregent of God and the Viceregent of the envoy of God. Hence, the capacity of completeness and the manifestation of all the inclusiveness, that is to say, through these things, these people are realized and individuated in

this degree and that degree is manifested and individuated in His manifestation with all its parts and totality, and the *insân-i-kâmil* is the manifestation of that degree, and the Ipseity of that degree and the Reality of that degree is manifested in all the envoys and prophets and the complete *awliya'* and purified people. Therefore, if a person is realized in that degree and understands that which is hinted at by the word *Allâh*, he is a knower, an '*âlim*'. And this brings us back to the quote: '*Wa idhâ jâ'athum âyatun, qâlû lan nû'min hatta nû'î mithl mâ ûtiya rasûl-Allâh Allâhu â'lamu haytha yaj'alu risâlatihi*', which is a different face for understanding this, but which again shows that the Ipseity of God becomes the ipseity of the envoy. And this '*âlim*' understands this, and this understanding is special to that person who comprehends the language of hinting. Therefore there are '*ârifin*' who, by the word *Allâh*, hint at that degree, but the Absolute Ipseity cannot be called by the Name *Allâh* and be conditioned by it because It is far transcendent from that.

The Wisdom of Elijah and the spirit of this chapter and its resumé is this, that in reality the order (*amr*) of being is divided into the effector and the effected; and the effector and the effected are two indications. The effector is from the degree of acting and the effected is from the degree of being effected upon, and there is no existent other than One Single Existent and there is no effected other than Him. Therefore, in every face, in every station, in every *ḥaḍrah*, what effects is God, and what is effected upon in every state, and in every place or in every Presence, is the universe. That is to say, the Truth which is effective, effects in every possibility and in every face of existence whether It be effecting with or without an agent. And It is effective in every state, like '*âlam-i-ghayb*' or *shahâdah* and like the spirit and feeling, and it is equal in all things; and whether this effect be through a thing which is manifest in immanence or from a place of manifestation, or whether it be from one Divine Name from among the Divine Names, the effector is always the Divine Ipseity by virtue of His Qualities and Names, because Names and Qualities are the incapacity of the incapacities and also the beginning of every thing from eternity. And those which are effected upon are the *a'yân* of the universe, because the *a'yân* are the places and provinces of Names and are the places of revelation of the Names; and the division of the *amr* into effector and effected has become the spirit of this Wisdom, because without a doubt there is a connection between the incapacity and the

incapacitated which can be no other than the relationship established between *haqq* and the universe.

The inclination of the non-existent thing towards existence requires from the existent Reality, *haqq*, its own existence, and when it does this, it causes to come out from the *haqq* the word *kun* (Be), and this is effect and what arrives from *haqq* is effect. Wherever the origin of the effect comes from, which is the manifestation of the effect of the effector in the effected, whether the effecting derives from the Divine Presence or whether it derives from the universe of possibilities, you have to attach it to its most suitable origin from whence it emanates. And therefore, if the effect derives from the Presence of Divinity, like the Divine Completions such as Existence, Knowledge and Power, you should attach these to the Divine Presence from where they emanate, and if that which derives from the universe of possibilities, like poverty, necessity, inability and lacks like this, and other lacks of immanence, you attribute them to the universe, because derivations without a doubt cannot be separate from a certain origin because indeed that which is derived has its source and its love and is derived from that; and that which is derived is like the Divine Love which is the effect of non-prescribed acts. For example, the Divine Love came, emanating from the non-prescribed acts of the servant. Therefore the Divine Love is a derived effect which is between the effector, which is what emanates from the non-prescribed acts of the servant, and the effected-upon, which is the *haqq*, and the result is that the effect comes about. That is to say, from this degree of Divine Love, *haqq* became the hearing and seeing and other powers of the servant. That means that this love is an effect which is already ascertained and which you are incapable of denying if you are a believer, because this effect exists even in religion. That is to say, in religion, it is established in the source of Divine Love, the non-prescribed actions of the servant which are its causes and the effects and this effect cannot be denied; but the effector and the effected-upon are one and the same existence. Hence God is according to one face, effector, and according to the other, the effected-upon, and God from the point of view of the degree of Divinity combines both *haqq* (the Truth) and the universe. In the non-prescribed acts of the servant, which causes Divine Love, the apparent effector is the servant and the effected-upon is He, *haqq*; but the ipseity of the servant ('*abd*') and the Ipseity of the Truth being the same, from that point of view again, the effector is *haqq* and the effected is the universe.

'*Aql-i-salîm* (the perfected intelligence) is the heart which is devoid of wrong beliefs and which exists according to the original nature and beauties of eternity. That is to say, the person who has the '*aql-i-salîm*' is a person who possesses, observes, the Divine revelation in the mirror of Nature. That is to say, he sees the Divine revelation in Man which is the mirror of Nature, so that this man observes God, Truth, *haqq*, in the Divine mirror through his taste (*dhawq*), and *haqq* reveals Himself to him in the mirror (place of revelation) of Nature; such as the Prophet who saw his Lord in the image of a youth, or like Moses to whom God revealed Himself in a bush and who observed Him there. Such people know what we are meaning by taste. This is one way, or there is the second way where a man has complete confidence in God and believes in it, but this second one does not see, does not have a place in which to observe, but he believes all the same what we say. However, if, as in the first case, the man is possessor of the natural mirrors in which the revelation takes place, he knows the truth of what we have said concerning the *amr*, which is divided into the effector and the effected, through his observation and taste, and observes that God is the effector in all the Divine Presences (*ḥaḍarât*) and the immanence; and that the effected are the *a'yân*. Therefore he returns and connects to its origin that thing which emanates from the entirety of immanence and the Divine Presences. But if he is not of the observant of the observant ones, and imitates what the prophets and equally all the *awliya'* have brought of this Divine news, he is in complete belief and surrender to the words of these people, like those of whom the *ḥadîth* says: 'The sincere believer is he who believes in what we have repeated to him.'

When an intelligent person sees in his dream an image or a Self-revelation of God in whatever image It might be, he would believe in it because of the *wahm* which had its determination over him, and it is impossible that he should not do so. For example, if a man says: 'I saw God in some image', even if God had appeared or revealed Himself in the form of a man, the intelligent believer believes in *haqq*, in the shape of the image in which He reveals Himself, and due to his *wahm*, knows God, *haqq*, is in all the images of revelation and that God may appear also in a human form. But the non-believer, who does not believe in prophets and revelations, he has an intelligence dominated by pure *wahm*, which means that he determines *wahm* because he imagines that his *wahm* is leading him into falsehood. Therefore, he

determines his *wahm* by falsehood. Hence the non-believer, through the view of his thought, imagines that that which he saw as revelation in the dream is impossible for God to appear as, and thereby transcends God from that image; and he was correct in his opinion, yet God is revealed and manifested in all images, in all common images, but this man spoils the determination of his *wahm* by false *wahm*, and transcends God from the image, and denies and does not accept what the envoys and religions have brought to him. But he has not understood, realized or seen that in doing this, he does not transcend God due to his *wahm*, but does the contrary, that is, he immanences God. (Because if you transcend God from any image in which He appears, then you confine Him to an image, which is acceptable to you. Thereby you limit Him to a single image and that is immanencing Him.) He is unaware of himself and because of this, that is to say, through *wahm* he transcends *haqq*—whereas *wahm* is subsistent in his own *nafs* and what he does is that he determines *haqq* by *wahm*. Had he known his *nafs* he would have determined by real *wahm*. The real *wahm* being that God is visible in every possible image; the false *wahm* is relegating God to only a certain image made of Him.

Equally, in the saying: '*Ad'ûnî astajib lakum*' ('Invite Me and I shall answer you'), the man who prays conjectures that God's closeness to him is in the same manner as in the closeness of material things and that his own existence is another kind of existence to God's and his intelligence corresponds to that. But the answerer could not be differentiated from the demander, if the demander were the same as the answerer; yet we know that God does not become the answerer, if the person who asks from the *haqq* is a separate existent. But when and if the demander is in reality the same as the answerer, since the ipseity of the demanding servant is the ipseity of the answering *haqq*, then He answers. Then in this case, there is no difference between the differences of the images; then the demander and the answerer, with respect to manifest and secret, are without a doubt two images of one existent, who is manifest with the demander, and interior (*bâṭin*) with the answerer. And the totality of all those images which are manifest through the existence of One *haqq*, are like members to the *haqq*. Just as by his members a person is many, though his existence is one, equally a person is many by his parts, but single in his reality. Thus it is certain that the person is really a single person. That is to say, as a person he is a single reality, and it is known that a person is not the

image of his feet and hands and his head, and that he is not the image of his head or eye. That is to say, a person is no other than his collectivity, which is the collectivity of his parts, and he is not outside of that, and that each part of a person is the same as that person, yet each image of a part of him is not the same as the image of another part. Hence, Truth is many, yet One. By images He is many; by Essence, He is One. That is to say, *ḥaqq* is One through the singleness of 'ayn and oneness of existence, and through images of revelation and of manifestation together with Names and Qualities and events attributable, It is many. In the same way, by being members of the human race, though each person is different to the other, yet by the reality of their being of the human race, they are the same. That is to say, the single 'ayn which is the existence of humanity produces an endless number of persons, and human existence manifests itself in endless numbers of individuals, each person belonging to the humankind. Hence Man, though he is one through the reality of the 'ayn of mankind, is at the same time many through the images of each different person.

It is the same way, when you look at the Truth, which is an existence both One and Unique, *wāḥid* and *aḥad*; just as you have seen yourself in many mirrors, and in one mirror, you have seen only one image, in the same way as you see the *ḥaqq*, Truth, in the mirrors of the Names, as many and several, and in one mirror, which is the Ipseity of Truth, you see Him as one image. If you want to see the existence of the One *ḥaqq*, then you look at the mirrors of the Names, and if you want to see the image of the Truth in Uniqueness, then you look into that mirror which is a mirror from among many mirrors of the Names, into the mirror of Uniqueness, and if you want to see your own image, according to Oneness, then do not look at the number of mirrors of the Divine Names, but look to that single mirror, so that in there you see the face of Unity, according to the Unity. '*Fahakadhâ huwa amr in faham*.' ('If you have understood, the *amr* itself is like this'). Do not be afraid, therefore, that by separating yourself from the images and forms which are your personal existences among the different degrees of existence, that you shall become non-existent; if you are non-existent, you become existent as a *waliyy* in the existence of *ḥaqq*. And do not be afraid to remove from yourself that which is a great veil to you from the Ipseity of *ḥaqq*, that veil which is your individuated existence and image of your *nafs*, and do not forget the *ḥadîth* which says: 'God loves bravery, even if it is for killing a thing

alive, for that thing alive is no other than your *nafs*.' Be an enemy to your enemy, which is your *nafs* which is between the two sides of your forehead, (*â'ada 'aduwaka nafsak.ɾ al-lati bayna janbayka*), which means that if one has killed the *nafs*, the things of the relativity fall off one and the Reality of the Divine Life becomes manifested in one and the existence of Man becomes realized by *haqq*'s pure existence.

In short, there is no way of killing a human being, except through his realization in *haqq*. Even when you have killed your self, you have done nothing; it is He who has killed your *nafs*. '*Wa mâ ramayta idh ramayta wa lâkin Allâhu ramâ*' ('You did not throw when you threw, but God threw') (Quran). 'Arabi says, look at this effector who when in the act of throwing, brought down the *haqq* to the station of the thrower and brought the *haqq* down to the image of Mohammed. And this is what happens when you kill your *nafs*. You do not kill your *nafs*, but He kills your *nafs*. Hence, when you hear what we have mentioned here which is the word of God, either you are a knower, if you have understood the knowledge in these words, according to the Reality of Knowledge, or maybe you are a person who submits to God and understands through imitative belief, if you are not going to understand it the way it really is, or you are not a believer, who determines *wahm* through *wahm* and looks upon an illusion through his mind.

As for the intellectual vision, here is a pointer for you concerning its weakness, from among other pointers, that the intellect determines over incapacity, so that definitely the incapacity does not become incapacitated for that incapacitated for whom incapacity is incapacity already; and this is nothing other than the determination of the intelligence for him. This is no secret that the intellect determines in this way. That is to say that the intelligence which is determined by the vision of the mind cannot comprehend things as they should be, and that which demonstrates this is this; that the intelligence is determinant upon incapacity, which means that incapacity does not become incapacitated for that which is its own incapacitated. On the other hand, in the knowledge of revelation, that is to say, in the Divine Knowledge, which is given by the Divine revelation, there is nothing other than this. And that which the knowledge of revelation gives is this, that in reality incapacity becomes incapacitated for that incapacitated for which incapacity is incapacity, because incapacity is the Ipseity of Uniqueness and that which is incapacitated is that which

is established in non-existence, because that which causes the bringing into existence of an established thing is the existence of *haqq*, Truth, and that thing which is established is brought into existence through the existence of *haqq*, Truth. Hence, in the bringing into existence of an established thing, incapacity is the existence of *haqq* and the established thing is the incapacitated. Hence, the case of the incapacity becoming incapacitated for its own incapacity is this, that the incapacitated non-existent '*ayn* in its eternal case of being established in the Divine Knowledge through the same incapacity which is no other than the Ipseity of Uniqueness, demands through its inclination and possibility of reception that incapacity bring it into existence and make it incapacitated for itself, which therefore means the '*ayn* of incapacity demands the existence of its incapacitated. And in this instance, the demand is the connection between the two sides. Hence, incapacity by virtue of being incapacity becomes incapacitated for its own incapacity, because *haqq* which brings into existence is the incapacity which brings into existence the existent; and to the bringing into existence of *haqq*, the existent incapacity, by its inclination, determines upon *haqq* and demands from It the bringing into existence. Hence, when *haqq* is incapacity, He becomes incapacitated for that for which He is the incapacitated. And in the same way also the incapacitated by virtue of being incapacity becomes incapacity for the incapacity by virtue of the fact that the incapacitated has demanded its own bringing into existence from *haqq* which is incapacity and by determining upon it through existence. Hence, the incapacitated by virtue of being incapacity for incapacity, becomes incapacity for the incapacity, and incapacity becomes incapacitated for it.

And that determination by which the intelligence determines, determined by inscribing it in vision. That is to say, at the level of the inscription of the place of the argument, it is veridic, because that determination by which the mind determined is this: a thing upon which depends the existence of another thing until it is realized by it, that thing is not dependent upon the existence of the thing, which incidentally is subsequent to it, through which it is realized in its own existence. And that thing is not dependent on the existence of that thing. That is to say, the existence of the first thing is not dependent on the existence of the second thing, unless the second thing, by existence, be the incapacity of it and that the first thing be the incapacitated of the second thing. And absolutely, a circle becomes

necessary. And the veracity of this determination becomes apparent when one has drawn away the two orders of intelligence from the meaning of qualification, because the Ipseity of Truth and Its existence, which is incapacity, when withdrawn from incapacitation, becomes transitive upon the existence of the incapacitated, and this is only if it takes the two orders of intelligence. Hence, of course, by virtue of the fact that the two orders are in qualification, they are definitely not dependent on either side. The aim of the intelligence, that is to say, the aim of the intelligent views in this determination or in this exposition, is its word, which whenever this (intelligence) sees a determination in a revelatory dream in a manner which is contrary to what the vision attributes to it, that is to say, in opposition to what the visual proof attributes to it, he says of this observation: indeed once the singleness of the 'ayn is established, then indeed that 'ayn in this multiplicity, that is to say, in the multiplicity of images, is also single; and that by virtue of that 'ayn being incapacity for one of the images among the many images, that is for one of the incapacitateds from among these incapacitated, though that 'ayn for its own incapacitated, will not become incapacitated for its own incapacitated, although it is its incapacity for its own incapacitated, that is to say, the single 'ayn, which is the Ipseity of the bringer into being, after it is established and is accorded that it is single in the multitude of images, even though that which is incapacity is the same single Reality as the incapacitated, that is to say, the singleness of 'ayn in this multitude of images, by virtue of being incapacity for one of the incapacitateds from among the incapacitateds, though it is the incapacity of its own incapacitated, by its 'ayn does not become incapacitated for its own incapacitated.

Perhaps it is rather because the singleness of 'ayn, flowing in the images of the incapacity and incapacitated by transferring into the images, that is to say, the singleness of 'ayn by manifesting in the image of an incapacitated, its determination which is in the image of incapacitation, transfers, transmutes itself to the determination in the image of incapacitatedness, and its determination in the image of incapacitatedness transfers itself to the determination which is in the image of incapacitation. That is to say, while the singleness of 'ayn in an image was incapacity for an incapacitated and while it was being determined upon by incapacitation and also while its incapacitated was being determined upon by its incapacitatedness, by virtue of the fact that the singleness of 'ayn transfers from the image of incapacity

to its image of its incapacitated, its determination of incapacitation transfers to its determination incapacitatedness. Hence incapacity becomes incapacitated for its own incapacitated and also its incapacitated becomes incapacity for it, and this is the aim. That is to say, this determination, (or this inscription, exposition), is the aim of the intelligence and the intelligent. If he appreciated the order as it is, and the vision of the order upon that thing where the order is, thus at the level of Divinity, (for the *'arîf* at the level of *kashf*—revelations—it is also established in this way of revelation by *kashf*), and if he were not arrested and established at the level of appreciation by mental vision, and if he were to pass through this degree of appreciating and reach the degree of *shuhûd* through Divine revelation, this above-mentioned face would not have been his aim. That is to say, if the intelligent appreciated the order as it stood he would not be established in the level of the vision of mind.

Now we say in the language of taste that in the singleness of *'ayn*, in both images, that is to say, in the images of incapacitation and incapacitatedness, the permission to receive the two orders is resultant by two considerations. Hence when the singleness of *'ayn* is incapacity, it has ability or permission or scope to be the incapacitated, and when it is the incapacitated it also has the ability and permission to be incapacity. That is to say, the singleness of *'ayn* in its own *'ayn* is collective of both the determinations of incapacitation and incapacitatedness. Hence the singleness of *'ayn* becomes incapacity by its incapacitation and incapacitated by its incapacitatedness, and by virtue of the *'ayn* of singleness of *'ayn*, because of this, by virtue of these stations, all these considerations are equal. And when and if in the determination of the veridic intelligence, the order concerning incapacitation is in this wise established, that is to say, at the level of veridic intelligence, it is possible for incapacity to be incapacitated for its own incapacitated, when this order is, in a manner of speech, in constriction at the level of intelligence. But in situations other than this constriction, wherein the ability of the intelligence is to be expansive, what sort of credence could you have concerning the expansion of vision of intelligence, whereby a meaning may manifest upon intelligence through Divine revelation? Hence as the Prophet showed, he could establish a thing which he could establish for God; although the intellect could equally establish it, he did something further, that which the intelligence is not free to comprehend, in which case the

addition of the Divine revelation is necessary, such as the qualities which are conjectural similarities, which the veridic intelligence does not find impossible, which at the same time it is not free to comprehend. Then he showed also this further, that though by itself the intelligence sees it impossible because it is against the demonstration of its vision, but in the revealed intelligence, it accepts it and stands by it. That is to say, when its reality is taken away from the senses, its reality is shown through Divine revelation and it is unveiled. We corroborate that vision, but if after this revelation the intellect is left to itself and the revelation is removed from him, he is left to his own determination, and he becomes perplexed about what he saw in the revelation because he has no doubt in what he has seen but because he is veiled, he remains perplexed!

If the servant which had revelation were to become the servant of *rabb*, that is to say, that which is going to be dominant in his existence is going to be the *rabb*, he refers his intelligence to the *rabb*. because intelligence is by virtue of revelation of the *rabb*, not by his own determination; but if the servant that has received the revelation were to be servant of vision and a servant of intelligence, that is to say, that which is dominant in his existence is vision and intelligence, he will refer the truth to the necessities of the determination of the vision. That is to say, he refers the truth that is apparent to his own determination, and he interprets this according to his own belief. For example, when the scientists and theologians hear Divine news and Quranic verses, if they do not fit into their mountain of knowledge, they interpret these and reduce them to that determination which their own intelligence has determined; but, withal, they are still believers for whom the word of *haqq* is incomprehensible, and intelligence is short of being able to comprehend the Divine words and realities of the Quran. And this perplexity, or equally referring of the *haqq* to the determination of the intelligence, would not have happened in Man, had not Man been veiled in this emanation from his later emanation. That is to say, as long as Man is conditioned by the determinations of the emanation of this world, and thereby is veiled from the emanation of the interior spirituality in him and from the emanation of the next world, all of which happens for the people of God while still in this world, he sees as impossible things that are contrary to the vision of the intellect, and he conditions the Absolute *amr* by virtue of the conditioning of the intellect. And that which they have seen as impossible

due to the necessities of the vision of intellect, that same thing they will admit at the level of revelation, but when they are detached from that moment of revelation and left alone with their *nafs*, they fall into perplexity concerning what they have seen. Therefore, if he is a servant of the *rabb*, he will refer the truth to the determination of the vision, and if he is a man appearing in accordance with the appearance of the next world, in this world, that man will not be perplexed from the comprehension of that which is beyond the understanding of the intelligence. Because gnostics or '*ârifin*' appear in this world and they are to all appearances in the image of this world. That is to say, they appear in the images of this world, qualified by the images of this world, so that people who are veiled think they are of this world, because their determination of this appearance in this world is current over them and they eat, they drink, they marry and they sleep. And also, for example, they are under some human qualities like vengeance and killing, whereas the truth is that God has already translated them in their interior into the appearance of the other world. They are manifested according to the appearance of the other world, and it is impossible for them to have been '*ârifin*' if they had not been manifested according to the appearance of the other world. By this it is meant that if there is a certain necessity for them to undertake an aim or if they wish for a certain reason to appear, they can appear in this world, according to the images of this world, and while they are here they are subject to the determinations of this world. Therefore, the people who see them, see them as persons existing in this world. Therefore, it is possible that Elijah in his second descent and his appearance be of this variety.

Hence the gnostics are unknown in the worldly image, and because of their manifestation under the determination of worldliness, nobody would understand that they are gnostics except those people for whom they are not unknown, that is, those who have had their vision opened by God (*başîrah*), and these people understand them according to the saying: 'My *awliyâ*' (saints) are under My slippers', and the greatest slipper of dearness ('*izzah*') is that worldly image. Hence there is not a single gnostic among gnostics of God who are gnostics due to the Divine revelation, who has not passed the Day of Judgement (*hashr*) in this world according to the next world. And what that man sees, the others do not see. What he observes, they do not observe, and this extraordinary situation of coming into this world through the next world, this God gives through His own special providence ('*inâyah*')

and specialized them in this order. That is to say, there is not one gnostic who is a gnostic through the Self-revelation of the Ipseity, who can avoid having received in his heart the revelation of the Ipseity and that his body, his existence is annihilated in that Divine revelation and who is manifested in the existence of Truth and realized in his appearance according to the order of the next world in this world, who is not in the subsistence after non-existence (*baqâ' òa'da-l fanâ'*), and that the Last Day of Judgement, which is the Great Day of Judgement and is the day of total annihilation of his existence and is the appearance of the *haqq* which is the assembly of the assembly which is daily and he is then assembled with the *haqq* and due to the Divine revelation is absolved from the conditions of private belief.

Hence the person who is a gnostic through Divine revelation is according to the laws of the next world, because Divine revelation is from the Presence of Divinity which comes from the revelation of the Ipseity through the Ipseity and not by means of the Divine Names; and the person who is a gnostic through the Divine revelation which comes through the Presence of Godhead, which is the collectivity of Divine Names, is a Perfect Man. That is to say, the way it is explained, the person who is according to these judgements is the Perfect Man. But the person who is a gnostic through a Divine Name, is by the subsistence of his existence conditioned (limited), and this person is not of this category, and it is not to the inclination of those of vision and witnessing. Hence, if a person desired to rise to the wisdom of the station of Elijah and Enoch, God will build him in the two appearances; one is the original appearance of Idris, who is the grandfather of Noah's father, after which he was elevated to the heavens, and his second appearance was descending as an envoy. For him, God assembled the two places of descent. One is the place of prophethood. He was a prophet before Noah, as he was Idris then; and the other is the second one, as an envoy as Elijah. Hence if a person descends through the determination of his own intelligence to the station of desires and becomes the absolute animal, he descends until he discovers (uncovers) what all the animals have uncovered or discovered, except the two with heavy or weighty natures; that is to say that he descends through the determination of his intelligence to the station of animal desires through extreme asceticism and reduction of the bodiliness and becomes an absolute animal, so that he reaches the state where things have no consideration in his mind and that he is in the degree of

animality, qualified only by life and liberated from intelligent thinking and conjectural beliefs, so that he uncovers all animals except Man and jinn. Because Man, by being unable to descend to the degree of absolute animality, in which station there is no *taşarruf*, and by being unable to be divorced from the conditions of intelligence and thought, he cannot descend to the degree of uncoveredness of the degree of animals. That is why all animals are people of *kashf*, because they are divorced from all conditions of intelligence. And when this man uncovers all that is uncovered by all the animals, he realizes that he is realized in his own animality, and that when Man descends further from the last degree of descent, which is that of the human being, and descends from his own animality, there is in him no essence left, except that of life, and he is absolutized by absolute animality, and at that state, from the instinctive knowledges of all the animals, he becomes knowledgeable and observes the running through in all the images, the life which is the One Reality. Therefore he knows by what virtue the single essence can be apparent both as Elijah and as Idris. And the signs of realization in the station of animality are two. One of these marks is what we have mentioned, that is to say, hence, the man who is realized in his own animality can see in the tombs who is in suffering and who is gratified and realized; he can see the dead as living through spiritual life; and he observes the silent as talking through words of the heart and sees the sitting as walking through spiritual motion. The second sign is speechlessness by virtue of that which is. If he wants to relate by speech to what he sees and speak it, he cannot speak, just as the animal cannot speak. When these two signs appear in him, he has reached the state of animality, and we had a student who went through this state of uncovering, only he was not kept through speechlessness; that is to say, he could speak of what he saw and he was not realized in animality.

When God put me in this station, I became realized in my animality with complete realization, and I could observe and wanted to speak through this state, but could not speak, and I could not differentiate between my station and the station of the people who are tongueless, dumb; and when one is uncovered in the station of animality and his speech is divorced from him, if he is not preserved in this station, that person does not become realized in animality, and the person who is not realized in animality cannot be realized in humanity. Referring back to what has been said before, which has been explained that one

'*ayn* is manifest in many images and that this one '*ayn* is the same as the many images, but is not particularized for that image; He is both that image and for that image, but He is not particularized for that image and is not conditioned by any of those images. Hence it is certain that the image which is the same as the '*ayn* in one of the many images, is the same '*ayn* which is in another image, and in another consideration that '*ayn* is not the same as the '*ayn* of another image by virtue of the image being different. Therefore, one can say that the envoy who was sent to Baalbek, (Elijah), by virtue of his '*ayn*, was Idris who was a *nabiyy* before Noah; and you can say his ascent received inspiration. It is also true to say by virtue of image and individuation, Idris is other than Elijah. This is also true to say, but do not let yourself be dressed by individuations, for you really know that while Idris was in the fourth heaven in the image of his 'I'-ness, therein resident, at the same time in the image of Elijah he was apparent and by the 'I'-ness of Elijah, he was determined in that. Hence, Idris and Elijah, by virtue of '*ayn* and reality, are one, and by appearance of the individuations of the images, individuated, personal to each, they are two and different people. Just as the manifestation of the realities of Gabriel, Michael and Azrael, who are able to appear in a thousand and one places in the same instant, all the images are existent and established through these perfect, total, and complete spirits. Therefore the spirits and *nafs* of the complete people are also like that. Hence, He gave to the Wisdom of Elijah and Idris which the Single '*ayn* and the Ipseity of Uniqueness, which is absoluteness and non-individuation, is far removed of pluralization by images, individuations and determinations.

Divine Names are infinite revelations and are revealed in non-restricted images of the Names, and are in one sense the same as all the images, and in another sense other than all the images. The opposing Qualities and differentiation of *a'yân* see with one face the plurality and by another face, the Unity, and are not veiled by plurality from the beauty of Oneness, and hence, when the one who wants to reach these has become realized in this station of animality, he transfers into that station in the degree of his descent. And transferring to the degree of pure intelligence, while he is in non-natural matter, that is to say he is transferred to pure intelligence from the conditions of nature, he becomes realized there, and this transference is the second transference, and he observes those orders which are origins of images

of things manifested in Nature. Hence he is in one sense the same as all the images, and in another sense is different from all the images. And the one who wants to rise to the wisdom of Elijah, let him descend to the realization of his own animality and descend from the degree of intelligence and its determination and become nothing but animal, until he has known through taste the mystery of the descent of Idris as Elijah who was sent to Baalbek as an envoy in the image of Elijah. And let him know this mystery through taste, and when he becomes an *'ârif* in both places of descent and has realized the reality of Truth in the vision of Truth at the highest sphere and has known in the *asfal* the seeing of *haqq*, and acquired a degree of realization in that degree, after that, through taste, let him be active in the way of the *'ayn* of Truth and the Ipseity of Uniqueness, and know and reach the plurality of Names and Qualities, and become qualified himself by the Unification of the Oneness of both stations; and in the Oneness, observe the Oneness of Beauty, and in plurality observe the plurality due to becoming knowledgeable in the knowledge of taste, from which station comes the determination which is in the image of Nature. That is to say, in the Universe of Intelligence, the intelligence which is one *'ayn*, observes the *nafs* in the Universe of *nafs*. Therefore it observes in the Universe of Intelligence, Pure Intelligence, and all orders which are origins for the natural images in the Universe of *asfal* (Lowest of the Low), then by taste he will know that the various determinations in the images of Nature are meanings of unknown *a'yân* and realities of total intelligences and that these are descended and have become manifested in the limited images of Nature. And also he will know that the One Reality which is the existence of the Unique Ipseity is the same as the Ipseity, and the *a'yân* are no other than pure meanings which are in the intelligent intellect of meanings, and that they are in the Universe of Intellect, Pure Intellect; and in the Universe of *nafs*, Pure *nafs*; in the Universe of Plants, Pure Plants; in the Universe of Minerals, Pure Minerals; in the Universe of Solids, Pure Solids; in the Universe of Crystallized things, Pure Crystals.

Hence the Single *'ayn* is manifest in all of these degrees in the natural images of the species, while at the same time in His Oneness, there is persistent all the while, the *ghana* (= *ghaniyyness*) of Ipseity, persistent in Its Oneness. Hence that One *'ayn* is the Source and Origin of all and is the returning place and arrival place of all *amr*. Hence that person who wants to reach the station of Elijah and Idris will observe

the Divine Ipseity descending from the station of Uniqueness to the degrees of immanence and Its manifestation in the noble (generous) and stingy, in the highest and lowest universes, and he observes the Truth in all the degrees of existence by *shuhûd*, observation, and becomes knowledgeable through taste, and he will deserve and reach (attain) that degree of greatest happiness and the highest place which is the collecting together, the assembling of the assembling, between oneness and plurality, and if to that man who attains this greatest degree, it were revealed that in reality Nature is the same as the *nafs-i-rahmânî*, indeed that man has been given great goodness. And from many ways to this because of the many ways of Nature, they are all the same as the *nafs-i-rahmânî*, but to certain ways (inclinations) this is apparent and to certain other ways, this is not apparent. And if it is revealed to him that the *nafs-ar-rahmân* is the same as the images of Nature, by virtue of its appearance as the images of Nature, the appearances of Nature are the same as the *nafs-ar-rahmân*, and that also by virtue of the images of Nature appearing in the *nafs-ar-rahmân*, then that man is made to receive the intelligence of *yaqîn* and *shuhûd* and the total and Divine Wisdom, which means that that Knowledge and Wisdom transfer with the existence of Its infinite number of Its images, transform the *u'yân* of the *khalq* to the Truth of the One and Unique, in which incidentally, there is no plurality; and the great good is the existence of One Truth. And if this man in the station of Pure Intelligence is wanting (lacking) what we have mentioned, according to what we have qualified and mentioned, then that which he should see of the origins of the orders in which are the origins of the things of manifestation (the images of Nature), and the fact that the Nature is the same as the *nafs-ar-rahmân*, is not revealed to him; then of knowledge which determines his conceptual intelligence, this much knowledge is enough for him. Hence this much knowledge for that man who wants to be complete and of the Wisdom of *inâsiyyah*, this much knowledge is enough to mention, and maybe if God surely Wills, He can guide the person who is individuated in this degree of completeness to that degree of most completeness, which is above it.

Of the Wisdom of Beneficence (*al-ḥikmat al-iḥsâniyyah*) in the Word of Loqman

IT was mentioned before this, as in the Wisdom of Abraham and in several other places, that indeed the totality of immanence (*kawn*) is food (*ghidhâ'*) and that Man with the determinations is the food of God because God became manifest with the determinations of Man's 'ayn, and the 'ayn-i-thâbita became hidden in that. The Being of the ḥaqq which is manifest in the 'ayn-i-thâbita of Man is fed by the determination of the 'ayn-i-thâbita, at the same time ḥaqq by Its effulgence of Being over Man is its food. When or if for Its own Being the Divine *mashî'a* appertained to the Will (*irâdah*) of nourishment, in other words, by virtue of the degree of Divinity when the Being of the ḥaqq which is actualized in the possibilities of the *a'yân* manifested the determinations of the Divine Names which are at the strength of that degree by manifesting in the places of manifestation of the *a'yân* of possibilities, and through Its *mashî'a* appertained to the Will (*irâdah*) of being nourished, then the totality of immanence becomes His nourishment, and all the Divine determinations which are actualized and manifested through the immanence are also His nourishment, simply because ḥaqq is manifest in the garments of Qualities and Names through the Divine determinations of immanence, and the immanence is the nourishment of the ḥaqq, by virtue of the manifestation (*ta'ayyun*) and the actualization (*muta'ayyin*) of the ḥaqq in the *a'yân* of the universes and in that which is manifested in the immanences.

By virtue of the fact that the Divine Identity (*huwiyyah*) is the same as His Ipseity, He is completely Rich beyond Need (*ghaniyy*) of the universes and of the totality of the Divine Names. The difference between *mashî'a* and *irâdah* is that His *mashî'a* is exactly the same as His Ipseity, and His Will (*irâdah*) is one of the Qualities which necessitate the Name *murîd*. Sometimes it does happen that the *mashî'a* is the same as the *irâdah* and sometimes it happens that it is different. In certain aspects the *mashî'a* is more generalized than the Will (*irâdah*)

and determines that which is appertaining to the *irâdah*, equally it may appertain to its dissociation (*nafiḍa*) from the *irâdah* and determine that way, as in the bringing into existence or taking into non-existence ('*adam*'). In fact, *mashî'a* appertains to bringing into existence as well as to making non-existent, but *irâdah* is of the realities of the Names thereby necessitating existence, as for instance, in the Quran the word '*irâdah*' is used for the case where the non-existent is brought into existence, but *irâdah* appertains to bringing into existence and does not appertain to taking away from existence except where the determination of the *mashî'a* is general and determines over the *irâdah*.

Therefore, *irâdah* appertains to *mashî'a*, and when God's *mashî'a* appertains to the *irâdah* concerning our nourishment, our nourishment becomes according to what His *mashî'a* demands. That is to say, by bringing into existence our *a'yân* of possibilities, His *mashî'a* appertained to the *irâdah* of making us nourished and He brings us into existence by His own Existence (*wujûd*) as His own *mashî'a* demands. and consequently, since His Identity (*huwiyyah*) is hidden in our being (*wujûd*), He brings us into manifestation; just as nourishment is hidden in the nourished. Consequently, the Identity (*huwiyyah*) of the *ḥaqq* is our food, because our being (*wujûd*) and shape and appearances are things of actualization, and our being and our being established in reality are by His Being (*wujûd*). Therefore, what is actualized (*muta'ayyin*) by us is His Being (*wujûd*), and our places of manifestation are Him and our nourishment and food result from His effusion of being, just as equally we are His food by the determinations. Equally, our becoming realized and our continuation in subsistence are through His Being, and the subsistence in existence of the determinations of His Names is through our *a'yân*. Under these considerations, if God's *mashî'a* appertains to His Will for our nourishment, He becomes our nourisher; and according to what our *a'yân* in the *ghayb* demanded and desired from Him, He becomes our nourishment. *Mashî'a* appertains both to non-existence and to existence, and Will (*irâdah*) appertains only to the coming into existence of a non-existent. Consequently, where the *mashî'a* and *irâdah* coincide in the bringing into existence of a thing which is non-existent, they are united, and by virtue of the fact that *mashî'a* is the same as Ipseity, and each Name refers to the Ipseity (*dhât*) and is the same as It, then according to this consideration *mashî'a* becomes the same as *irâdah*. According to this, the Shaykh says the *mashî'a*

of the *ḥaqq* is His *irâdah*, that is to say, in action and in bringing into being, and in appertaining to and in indicating the Ipseity, they are united. Consequently therefore, you must determine and act according to the *mashî'a* which necessitates bringing into being and which is the same as the *irâdah*, since He indeed desired the Will. Hence *irâdah* is the aim (*murâd*) of the *mashî'a*. In other words, in one way the *mashî'a* and the *irâdah* are the same, but in another way they are different. Therefore, you determine by the *mashî'a* which appertained to the *irâdah*, since the *irâdah* is the aim (*murâd*) of the *mashî'a*.

In short, the intention of 'Arabi is that sometimes *mashî'a* appertains to the Will, and sometimes it appertains to the Will of increase which is Union, sometimes to the Will of decrease which is non-existence. In other words, the *mashî'a* of *ḥaqq* aims at increase which is bringing into existence, and equally aims at decrease which is bringing into non-existence after bringing into existence. Whereas in any case in either of these parts, the *ḥaqq* has no other *mashî'a* than the Absolute *mashî'a* which appertains both to the bringing into existence and the taking out of existence. Therefore, the *mashî'a* appertains to the general whereas *irâdah* appertains to bringing into existence, as has been mentioned. In other words, that which has been mentioned is the difference between *mashî'a* and *irâdah* resulting from the different facets. Therefore be knowledgeable in this, that from one point of view the reality of both these things is no other than the totality of singularity, and in this respect they are both the same *'ayn* and there is no difference between them, and when they appertain to the bringing into being of something they are both the same thing and there is no difference between them. The Shaykh mentioned this problem in this Wisdom because this chapter includes the Wisdom of Nourishment (*rizq*) and without a doubt concerns the arrival of all the nourishment to all the nourished, and this chapter according to its meaning includes the manner of the arrival of the nourishment.

The Wisdom of the knowledge of the reality of things as they are is in what God said concerning Loqman: 'We gave wisdom to Loqman, and when wisdom (*ḥikmah*) is given, great good is established.' That is to say: 'Indeed We gave Loqman wisdom', and wisdom is the knowledge of the reality of things as they are. Wisdom is a kind of knowledge, and that person to whom wisdom has been given, indeed to him is given great goodness, and what greater goodness can happen to one than that he is qualified by the knowledge of things as they

are with the Divine Knowledge, and that he knows and is 'ârif of everything according to what their reality requires, and he places them in their proper place? Loqman is the possessor of great goodness by Divine stipulation (*naşş*) by virtue of the fact that God has stood witness that Loqman has been given a great deal of goodness (*khayr*).

Sometimes wisdom happens by verbal reference to wisdom which means that that state gives speech, in which case speech in its place becomes wisdom. Sometimes however, wisdom is silence when the state gives silence to it, in which case silence also becomes wisdom in its place, just as Loqman stood in silence instead of questioning David as to what he was making. When he saw David working, he wished to ask David what the thing was he was making, but he kept silent until David had finished what he was doing. Then David put it on and said: 'Yes, this is war clothing', and Loqman said: 'Yes, the creation (*khalq*) is patience', and David said to Loqman: 'Holding one's peace is wisdom and very few act this way.'

An example of the spoken wisdom (*hikmah*) is as follows: Loqman said to his son: 'If all the works of men were as small as a mustard seed and that mustard seed was in the middle of the desert or in the heavens or on the earth somewhere, God, who encompasses all from the heights of heaven to the depths of the earth, takes account of it.' The wisdom contained in this is that Loqman referred to God the taking into account of each grain, and God repeated Loqman's words in His Book and did not say that these words were the words of Loqman who had spoken them, which means that these words are the spoken wisdom, because if you know that it is impossible that anything can happen outside of the Knowledge of God which encompasses all the Divine knowledges, then it is necessary that you speak according to that.

Then there is the other silent wisdom and that wisdom becomes known by the association of the state, which is exemplified by the fact that Loqman refrained from specifying to whom this seed is given. This keeping silent is exactly the same as the wisdom which has not been spoken in that the meaning can be discerned from the state of the person, just as here Loqman mentioned that God was going to reckon by each grain but did not mention specifically the person to whom each grain belonged. What has become understood from this knowledge by inference is that whoever executes a task either good or bad, he will be recompensed according to that action, but the recompense

for the good action is necessarily going to happen whereas the recompense for the bad action may not happen at all if God wills. (He did not say to his son that the mustard seed was specific to him but he took the reckoning by the grain in general, and in this way he made the person for whom the grain is reckoned a general being rather than a specific being, by not saying 'for you' or 'for other than you'.)

Then Loqman, in his speech, placed the grain in the heavens and on the earth, warning the one who is looking at these words of Loqman to see therein that it is God Himself who is in the heavens and in the earth, and recall to mind the Divine saying and transpose himself to the saying: 'And indeed He, God, is in the heavens and in the earth' (*wa huwa allâhu fi-s samâwâti wa fi-l ard*). And as God is existent in both the heavens and in the earth, he knows that God is actualized and present both in the heavenly *a'yân* of the Names and the spiritual realities of immanence and the *a'yân* of creation on earth. Consequently, through the effusion of the Divine Names and the heavens of the realities of the Names, and by the effusion of the revelation of Lordship of nourishment in the *a'yân* of the creations of the earth, by the total meaning of all this being God, God bestows through this then, by virtue of the fact that God is the same as the nourishment and the nourished, because God is the same as the Divine treasures and the spiritual nourishments in the heavens and the earth. When God gives out the nourishment which is on the earth and in the heavens, to anybody, He gives it by being the same as both the nourisher and the nourished. Thereby He becomes in Being the nourishment of the *a'yân* of our non-existence.

Loqman then had told his son both by what he mentioned and by what he did not mention, which is that indeed God is the same as all that is known, whether what is known exists in the *'ayn* or whether it exists in the Knowledge. That is to say, Loqman advised by what he said that the *haqq* is the same as all that exists outside of Him, and by that thing over which he was silent he advised that the *haqq* is the same in knowledge as each thing known, and that He is established and subsistent (*bâqi*) in the Knowledge of the *ghayb* and is not qualified by the existence of the *'ayn*. In other words, in the higher spheres which are the realities of the Names and in the spiritual states which are called 'heavens' and in the lower spheres in the reality of the immanence, and in the individual bodies which are called the earth, the Identity (*huwiyyah*) of the *haqq* is manifest through Divinity

and Lordship. Thus *ḥaqq* becomes the same as all that is known which exists by the *‘ayn* of its existence, and equally becomes the same as the interior identity (*huwiyyah*) of all things which exist in the realities of all the higher or lower spheres, and becomes established therein with the existence of Its Knowledge of Being because It is more general than thing.

The face of that which is known being more general than thing is due to this: that for the thing known there are three degrees. One degree is the degree of Singularity, which is that the unknown letters of the instants of the Ipseity which are the same as the Ipseity, are the Knowledges of the relationships of the Ipseity which are potentially present in the Ipseity. In this degree the relationships of the Ipseity which are the letters in the *ghayb*, by virtue of the fact that the Knowledge of the *ḥaqq* is the same as the Ipseity, are the Knowledges of the *ḥaqq*, and this degree is the degree of Absoluteness of the *ḥaqq* and the degree of non-manifestation (*la ta‘ayyun*), and at this degree Knowledges are one the same as the other, and here the word ‘thing’ cannot be applied to the Knowledges because in this there is no specification of any face from among the faces, and here the Knower and that which is known are the *ḥaqq*.

Another degree is the degree of Oneness, and this is the degree of Divine Knowledge, in which degree the Divine Essential Ipseity together with the Knowledge of the Knowledges and the Knowledge of manifestation of things which are in the *ghayb* are here actualized and established. Consequently, it is possible to attribute the Knowledge of Knowledges and the things of the *ghayb* to the *a‘yân* of the *ghayb* which are actualized in the Presence of Knowledge. And at this degree, the *a‘yân* are differentiated the one from the other, and for Knowledge here, thingness becomes accident.

When the Divine *mashî‘a* appertains to the bringing into existence of a thing, the Divine Will (*irâdah*) specializes that thing to be brought about, and that thing becomes existent with the being of sensitivity and the being of *‘ayn* and to that is attributed the thing that exists and is known. That is why one calls it existent, because by its being sensitivity it is the most manifest and the most totally total of all the degrees of existence. Thereby it is ‘existent’ and it is ‘the known’ because it is known to the *ḥaqq*. And this degree for the degrees of the known becomes the third degree, but for the thing is established two degrees (*martabah*). One of these degrees is its thingness in the

establishment of Knowledge, and the other degree is its thingness in the being of 'ayn. (Here is a quote from Sadruddin-i-Konevi in his book, *Nafahât ash-Shay'iyah*. The 'ârif Shaykh, breast of the people and religion, the Konevi, in his book of *Nafahât* says: 'Indeed according to law and according to reality thingness can be attributed according to two considerations: one of these is the thingness of being and the other is the thingness of establishment. The meaning of the thingness of being is that the being of the immanence is an existent thing by its own 'ayn according to its own being and according to others. And this part is what is known by everybody. The second consideration of the thingness, which is called 'thingness of establishment', is an image of the knowledgeability of everything in the Knowledge of the *haqq* from eternity, for ever, established in the one and only manner and never changing or exchanging, and it is differentiated from other knowledges by its specialness.')'

And for the known there are established three degrees, and the thing which is known has become singularized and differentiated from the thing by its establishment in the Unknown Essential Absoluteness. And thus the known has become more general than the thing, and has become the most denied of the denials because it refers to the realities of the Essential *ghayb* which is unknown. Because of this, this was explained by: 'God is the same as al' known things' (*inna al haqq kullu shay'in ma'lûm*), and not explained by the words: 'God is the same as everything' (*inna al haqq 'aynu kulli shay'*), because if it had been said that God is the same as everything and if He were specialized this way, then it would be that the Identity (*huwiyyah*) of the *haqq* would be specialized to the things of knowledge and the things of existence, and the Knowledge of the *ghayb* which is the Knowledge of the Ipseity would have been left out of what the Ipseity encompassed, whereas this degree is prior to the two degrees mentioned.

It is because of this that it was mentioned and explained by that which refers to the trinity, and the majority of the commentators differentiated the thing from that which is known in this way: that the thing is that which has its own 'ayn of existence and that which is known is reachable by the thing which has its own 'ayn of existence to the thing which has no 'ayn of existence. Many commentators have not differentiated the thing from that which is known by another aspect, by saying that what the Shaykh intends by 'thing' is that which exists with its own 'ayn of existence, but in this way of representing

the situation there is no differentiation between the two propositions, since that which is known refers both to the existence of knowledge and the existence of 'ayn, and thing also refers to existence of knowledge and existence of 'ayn, and this way of expressing it is contrary to the belief and the way of the Shaykh, because the Shaykh, by referring to the Divine saying: 'We told it "Be" and it became (*kun fayakun*)', specifies that before God brought about the existence of the things in the existence of 'ayn by the Word '*kun*', that thing was already qualified by thingness in the existence of Knowledge and they were already established in their thingnesses. He has several times commented on this, and equally he has mentioned it here in the chapter of Salih, that all this is in accordance with the trinity of the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, the Will of the *ḥaqq* and the Word of the *ḥaqq*. Pay attention to the fact of how he gives importance to the thingnesses of a thing while it is still in the state of non-existence in the Divine Knowledge, and makes this one of the rules of bringing into existence—this is a point for serious consideration.

After this, Loqman completed the wisdom and perfected (*iṣṭifâ*) it, so that the emergence of Loqman became perfected in wisdom and knowledge, and said: 'Indeed God is endlessly Munificent (*laṭîf*).' It is indeed from God's extreme Beauty and Lightness and Munificence (*laṭâfah*) that within that thing He is the same as that thing which is called by its own name and which is limited by its own limitations. That is to say, it is because of the fluence of God's extreme Beauty and Munificence in the visible things, which are called by different names and which are limited by specific limits, that He became the same as they are. Yet a thing that has a specific name and is called by that name, cannot possibly be transcended, and it cannot be said that that thing's name points to Him even by correspondence or by manner of speech. That is to say, the Uniqueness of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of Its 'ayn, though It is faithful to the visible things which are limited by different limits and have specific names, and though It is the same as they are, yet Absoluteness and transcendence cannot be attributed to those things. It is said for the things that are called by the special names that: 'This is the sky, this is the earth, this is the desert, this is the tree, this is the animal, this is the angel, this is nourishment, this is the food', even though the 'ayn which is manifest and revealed by all the things and is manifested and exists in all the things, is the One 'ayn. That is to say, that which is manifest and revealed by each of the existent

things which are called by different names, and that which is revealed as manifestations of each of these things and the 'ayn which is manifest and existent in them, is the One 'ayn.

These words conform to what the Ash'arites say, since they affirm that the totality of the universe is equal to the jewel. The universe is one jewel, and when they say the totality of the universe is one jewel, it is the same as when we say it is one 'ayn, by which we mean it is one 'ayn in all the things. Then the Ash'arites say: 'And the universe which is one jewel varies by the accidents', and this saying is what we say when we say: 'And they vary and increase by relationship and by image', and what they say is the same as what we say.

And one 'ayn by varied images and multiple relationships becomes varied and many until the images and relationships become differentiated the one from the other. It is said of a thing, this thing is not the same as the other thing by virtue of its different relationship, but say it as you wish, it is the same thing by virtue of its jewel. That is to say, in our words, that this thing, for instance a stone, by virtue of its image is not the same as that thing, for instance a stick. And in the words of the Ash'arites this thing is not the same as another thing by virtue of its nature, width etc. In their words they are the same by virtue of the jewel, and in our words this thing is the same as the other thing by virtue of its oneness of 'ayn. And one thing being the same as another by virtue of its jewelness at the level of each image and each nature, it is taken as the same as each jewel. That is to say, of all the existents, each existent being taken at the level of existence is taken to be the same as the jewel. But we say indeed the jewel is not the same as the *haqq*, but the Ash'arites think that in fact what is meant by jewel, even if it is the *haqq*, is not the same as the *haqq*, which the people of insight (*ahl-i-kashf*) and revelation transcend. And that is the Great and Holy God who is the creator of each thing and the nourisher of each thing. In other words, although the Ash'arites say that in all the images of the universe there is the singularity of the jewel, they still come to believe in the duality of the 'ayn, and they add that in the universe that which is the 'ayn of the jewel is other than the *haqq*, but the order is not like what they say, because the *haqq* is Existent and Unique and One and He is Exalted (*muta'ali*) in such a way that it is beyond possibility to consider that in existence the Reality therein is non-existent. Therefore we say that in existence there is nothing other than the *haqq* which is One Reality and One 'ayn, and that that

which is in the existent and in the witnessed in His Existence and no other.

But for this One Reality there are degrees of manifestation which are infinite in actualization and in individuation (*tashakkhkhus*) from eternity. And the first degree of that One Reality is that It is Absolute from all considerations and conditions and It cannot be specified and It is in a state of non-manifestation (*la ta'ayyun*). And the second degree is the manifestation of that Reality in Its own Ipseity and Its own 'ayn with such a manifestation that It includes, contains, brings together and unites all the manifestations of actions of Divine Necessarily-so-ness and the manifestations of the immanential acted-upon-nesses. And the third degree is such that it contains and brings together all the manifestations of action in effect, and this degree is the degree of Divinity, and that which becomes actualized in this degree is the High and Holy God. After this comes the degree of chaptering which for the degree of Divine Singularity is the degree and Presence of the Names. After that is the degree which contains all the manifestations of acted-upon-nesses and inherent in this degree and necessitated by it are the qualities of being effected, being acted upon, being under conditions and being brought low. And this is the degree of immanential possibilities of creation. And after that, for the degree of singularity of totality of immanence there is the degree of chaptering, and that is the degree of the universes. After that the genres, species, classes, members and parts and accidents and relationships of chaptering and the manifestation of the many and varied and the plurality of images, which do not detract from the singularity of 'ayn (*aḥadiyyat-ul-'ayn*) because nothing other than the One 'ayn is made real in Its own Ipseity. In fact this One 'ayn is fluent in all of these degrees and realities with the singularity of the totality of Its Self (*nafs*), Its Effusion (*fayḍ*) and Its Being (*wujūd*). And that totality of personal Compassion (*rahmân*) in these degrees and realities is where He is She, just as the degrees and realities in that totality of personal Compassion is where She is He.

'God is, and with Him there is no thing' (*kâna allâhu wa lam yakun ma'ahu shay'un*), and this is the wisdom of His being *latîf*, since the *ḥaqq* is fluent in things and the same as things. And it is because of the fluence of the *ḥaqq* in all things that He called His Self *latîf*. After this Loqman qualified and praised God by adding the word *khabîr*—which means that He is knowledgeable with the knowledge that results from

being informed (*ikhtibâr*). In other words, this knowledge of being informed is the knowledge which benefits from God's saying: 'And We shall test them until We know.' This knowledge of information is the knowledge of tastes, and the establishment of this knowledge for the *ḥaqq* is by virtue of the reality of the existence (*wujûd*) of the servants. In other words, for the Divine Identity (*huwiyyah*) this knowledge through being informed, resultant by the existence of taste (*dhawq*) and conscience, happens by virtue of His manifestation of the Divine Identity (*huwiyyah*) which is both actualized and fluent in the places of manifestation in the people of taste and perfection.

While the *ḥaqq* knew of that thing upon which His order (*amr*) is, He made His *nafs* subject to profiting from a knowledge. That is, He qualified His own *nafs* by learning a knowledge, and it is impossible to deny a thing that God has stipulated upon His Self, which means that by doing that which He has done, God differentiated between the Absolute Knowledge and knowledge through taste by saying: '. . . until We know', which is from the Presence of the Name *khabîr* which is differentiated from the Name '*alîm*' by being conditioned by taste, since Knowledge is a quality of the Ipseity and therefore is not added onto the Ipseity. The Name '*alîm*' is the same as the Ipseity and does not depend on another thing to manifest its relationship since He knows Himself by His own Self. But the knowledge which manifests by virtue of there being places of manifestation, which is knowledge of information, is not like this. Knowledge of taste is conditioned by the faculties of strength (*qûwah*). In other words, it results by the tastes of the faculties, because the one who has taste (*dhâ'iq*) does not taste the knowledge of taste except by his spiritual faculties, or by bodily faculties. Which means that unless God, the *ḥaqq*, becomes the same as the faculties of the members of the servant, and unless the knowledge of taste (*'ilm-i-dhawq*) results in the servant in all his members and with all kinds of strength by virtue of the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in the existence of the servant, there does not result for the existence of the *ḥaqq* the knowledge of taste and the informative knowledge. And this is for the existence of God which is revealed and actualized in the existence of Man with the faculties of the man in the place of manifestation of the Perfect Man by virtue of the fact that *ḥaqq* has made Himself the acquirer of knowledge. And all this is for the knowledge to result, whereas God by His Ipseity is *ghaniyy* from the universes, and equally by His Knowledge is *ghaniyy* from the

universes, and knows from eternity to infinity all the things even before the qualification of things by their thingness.

In fact God informed His own *nafs* that in reality He is the same as the faculties of His servant, as in the saying: 'I become their hearing . . .', and hearing is one of the faculties from among the faculties of the servant; equally, seeing is one of the faculties from among the faculties of the servant. In the same way, the tongue is one of the members of the servant, so equally is the foot, where the servant in this limb unites the faculty with the limbs, and here his faculty is no different from his limbs, and they are the same. And God is the 'ayn of what is understood by servant. That is to say, the reality and the identity (*huwiyyah*) of the servant is the *haqq*, though He is completely abstracted from (*mujarrad*) and devoid of attribution of servanthood. And when the 'ayn of the servant is qualified by servanthood he is not the same as the Lord when the Lord is qualified by Lordship, because each of the attributions (*nisab*) are by their own ipseity different from the other and each relationship by its reality is different from another, just as faculties and members are by their attribution differentiated from one another; but the *haqq* which is One Being to which everything is attributed by its existence is not differentiated, because in reality the situation is such that in existence in all attributions there is nothing other than His 'ayn. Consequently, that to which everything is attributed is One 'ayn which is the owner of all attributions and qualifications. But the attribution of servanthood by its own self is not the same as the attribution of Lordship by its own essentiality (*dhât*). And even if the One Existent to which everything is attributable is manifest and actualized in servanthood and Lordship, and though because of manifestation, servanthood and Lordship could be attributed to it, yet the existence manifested in the servant is not the same as the one qualified by Lordship, simply because the attributions are differentiated.

Then, according to this, in the words: 'I am their hearing . . .', *haqq* becomes actualized in the existence of the servant and is manifested in his several faculties and is not differentiated here, considering that He is the same as all his faculties. But as He specifies: 'I become his hearing, his vision and his hand and his foot', *haqq* becomes his faculties and He is inherent in all his faculties, yet emerges and manifests from each of these faculties and is essentially differentiated in each. And by virtue of each of these relationships, to the *haqq*

which is manifest in the being (*wujûd*) of the servant results a knowledge, which knowledge does not result from another one of these relationships. Considering that the Being (*wujûd*) of the *ḥaqq* is the same as the totality of the faculties, He is undifferentiated, since there is no otherness in the faculties, yet in each of the faculties by virtue of manifestation, in each of these He is differentiated since the attributions are differentiated one from the other. So, if you want, consider the One Being after which the servant is called 'servant', as servant, or else that the *ḥaqq* by Its Ipseity is One and by attribution of faculties is many, and with this that the *ḥaqq* is One and Unique by Its Ipseity and there is no differentiation in the Singularity of Ipseity, since there is no otherness possible in It, and that He is many by attributions and qualifications and happenings and qualities, and these are differentiated one from the other by their reality and their ipseity.

Loqman instructed his son with the two Names of God, *laṭîf* and *khabîr*, and said: 'Indeed God is *laṭîf* and *khabîr*' (*inna allâhu laṭîf khabîr*), and what happens from his teaching his son these two Names shows the completion of the wisdom of Loqman. If Loqman had mentioned these two Names in the image of the word '*kawn*' (immanence) which is the bestower of existence, and if he had mentioned these two Names in conjunction with the word '*kâna*' which is the word of being, and had said: 'Indeed God was *laṭîf* and *khabîr*' (*wa kâna allâhu laṭîfan khabîra*), Loqman would have been even more superlatively complete in his wisdom and more eloquent in address and in envoyship, because the word of being which is *kâna* (*kawn* — immanence, and *kun*—be, from the same root) would have shown that God the High was for eternity qualified by these two qualities and that these two qualities were the necessary components of His Ipseity. Because the words: '*Wa kâna allâhu laṭîfan khabîra*' would have been informing of the informative knowledge that God is forever in His Ipseity *laṭîf* and *khabîr*, and in the same way equally now is *laṭîf* and *khabîr*. But when we say only: 'He is *laṭîf* and *khabîr*', this saying becomes pure information, though it is all the same possible that it may inform from the informative knowledge, and does not necessarily mean that God's Being (*wujûd*) necessitated these qualities. It may also be that according to his own belief in his vision of intellect, Loqman only meant to give information without referring to the informative knowledge (*khubr*), or this might be by virtue of something else in him, that he said: 'God is *laṭîf* and *khabîr*', without

referring to the informative knowledge (*khubr*); yet if Loqman had said it with the word of being (*kâna*) and had said: '*Wa kâna allâhu laṭîfan khabîra*', he would have been more superlative in wisdom and eloquence, because the word of being (*kâna*) shows that God was since ever *laṭîf* and *khabîr* because the Being (*wujûd*) of *ḥaqq* requires this attribution to be so. But as it happens, Loqman was in the matter of informing, and used this form of speech together with the word which emphasizes and stresses, so that Loqman's son becomes in his own *nafs* established and made certain that God is now in reality like this, and Loqman, in establishing the two Names of *laṭîf* and *khabîr*, qualified the High God by the Absolute Knowledge and the relative knowledge which is the knowledge of taste, because considering that God is *laṭîf* He is the total '*ayn* and He is the all-encompassing Knower since He knows the total. And this knowledge is the Absolute Knowledge, and the *ḥaqq*, by virtue of the fact that He is *khabîr*, is knowledgeable by the knowledge of taste, because from information (*khubr*) results the knowledge of tastes. Hence Loqman, in these two Names which belong to the High God, synthesized his knowledge.

God recounted the words of Loqman exactly in their meaning as Loqman had said them, and He did not add anything to it, and the two words, *laṭîf* and *khabîr*, are the meaning of the symbol which is current upon Loqman's words, and it is the meaning which is the symbol of these words that God, having translated it into the Arabic language, mentioned it in the Quran and told it to the Prophet to tell him of the story according to that meaning. What the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, tries to show here is that though the words: '*Wa kâna allâhu laṭîfan khabîra*' are more complete than the words: '*Inna allâhu laṭîf khabîr*', this is what God recounted to the Prophet even though God is certainly the most eloquent. These words were not brought down according to the superlative wisdom, and the question arises here of words being brought down not in the superlative wisdom. It is to eliminate such questions arising that the Shaykh said: 'God narrated the words of Loqman according to their meaning when their meaning may refer to the meaning that Loqman gave them.'

God, having understood what Loqman meant, translated his word exactly, knowing that had he said it in Arabic he would have said it the same way. God simply translated the words and did not add to it because these words were Loqman's words to his son. Loqman did have wisdom but wisdom is given out according to the station and his

son was in the station of being taught and had not yet knowledge of the reality of things. That is why he said it in this way, out of his kindness and extreme pity for his son. He spoke it in a way which was closer to the boy's understanding, so that his son in his own *nafs* from these informations given to him became realized and established in the station (*maqâm*) of information. However, it could have equally been suitable that Loqman said what he said in the superlative manner and in the completion of wisdom, but we excuse Loqman for not using the language of wisdom, because that wisdom's orphanage is of the possession of the orphan and inherited possession of the Prophet Mohammed: 'Do not go near the possession of the orphan', and that phrase is of the speciality of Mohammed and is forbidden to those who have not risen to that station (*maqâm*). Therefore Loqman's wisdom is in completion and perfection according to his degree and time. Equally, in comparison with other prophets, Mohammed is appointed with total possession of faculties and superior completions (*fadl*).

If Loqman had spoken with the same degree of completeness that the Shaykh refers to, in wisdom he would have had to have been of the people of Mohammed, whereas the prophets are forbidden from reaching or attaining to the Mohammedian degree to be able to preserve the degrees of their prophethood; but in the isthmuses of the other world it is not forbidden; there they reach, there they attain.

In the Quranic saying: 'He who does the *dharrah* of good and he who does the *dharrah* of ill', in this case '*dharrah*' refers to the smallest thing that can be nourished, and had there been something smaller He would have mentioned it. And indeed God brought the word '*dharrah*' to be the most small thing, and Loqman mentioned his son's name in the diminutive because diminutive is *rahmah*, and warned him in the way that will give him happiness and mercy. And when he warned his son, saying: 'Do not attribute *shirk* to God', his warning was that in reality *shirk* is the greatest oppression. And what is understood from this was that if he did that, the child's own *nafs* would be under oppression, since to establish *nafs* and existence is oppression (*zulm*) upon the station of Uniqueness. That is why to repudiate all conjecture (*wahm*) of misunderstanding he clarified the situation by mentioning the word '*zulm*'—oppression. Just as to cause polytheism (*shirk*) is *zulm* to the station of Uniqueness, that which is oppressed is the station of Uniqueness and the one who does the *shirk* brings it about by qualifying that station by partition. Whereas that station does

not accept the qualification by partition, and there is no partition in that, because the degree of Divinity is one 'ayn which includes all the faces, and if that station is one 'ayn it cannot possibly contain partition and plurality, even though that station is receptive to different images and qualifications, because in reality if the polytheist (*mushrik*) had attributed polytheism to God, he would have done so by incorporating another divinity which would have been the same thing as God Himself, because the One 'ayn is present in all the images of existence and there is no form outside of its compass. So if the polytheist joins to God whichever of the images of existence, he does not conjoin except by a thing which is other than the same as the *haqq*, and to cause polytheism by associating with the degree of Divinity and to God that which is exactly the same as the *haqq* is the extreme limit of ignorance, since the degree of Divinity contains all things and there is in being nothing outside of it. Consequently, if somebody is a polytheist of this kind he apparently has absolutely no knowledge of the order, which means that he is not 'arif of that which is necessary for the existence of the *haqq* which is One 'ayn, and equally, he has no knowledge of the reality of things, and he does not know that there are the different images that manifest from the One 'ayn and that in reality these differences happen within the One 'ayn and there is no image outside of it, so that he can only associate an image in that station with another image of the same station. Consequently, he takes a portion of that station for both of the images he is associating. That is to say, in that One 'ayn in which these images of being were manifested and carried, he makes for each of these images of that same One 'ayn a portion. And for two images he establishes the station which is the One 'ayn and then divides it. Had he made private that station to one image he would have believed in that image and would have denied other images and would not have become a polytheist (*mushrik*), and would have covered up the *haqq* in the other portion; so polytheism is to divide that station into two. And it is understood that in a partner (*sharik*), in fact that order which is special to him because of a thing wherein has happened an association, is not the same order as for the other partner, so that he cannot become associated with it because that order is the particular possession of the other.

According to this then, in existence, in reality, there is no partnership because each one is according to his own predilection, since it is said of that station that in reality between the two partners there is

partnership, which means that each of the partners has a predilection for a different thing in which the other partner has no interest. Consequently, according to appearance there is no partner. And the reason for this word concerning the existence of associate is because of joint ownership (*mushâ'a*), that is to say, it is the partnership in the Indivisible One 'ayn. And if one 'ayn is common to two partners, since in reality execution (*taṣrîf*) on the part of one of the associated removes the possibility of there being joint ownership and there is no doubt that the High God is the Absolute Executor in the universe, consequently there is no joint ownership, and there is no *sharîk*. Consequently, in the One 'ayn and in the Divinity, which is the degree of Oneness, there is no association, neither in the images or manifestation nor in reality. And the order stays upon Unity and this establishes the plurality of the Beautiful Names (*asmâ' al-ḥusnâ*) for God and thereby equally for the *rahmân*. (Quranic quotation: 'Say: Invite God or invite the *rahmân*'— 'Qul: ad'u allâh aw' id'u ar-rahmân.')

At that degree for the people who are veiled, association manifests through conjecture (*wahm*) because God established the collectivity of the Divine Names for each one of the Divine Names, from the *rahmân*. Then God and *rahmân* became associates at that degree of collectivity, yet, all the same, from among the Divine Images association is conjecture, because the Divine Image by Its essence is One, and invitation is to the Divine Image or to the One Ipseity (*dhât*) in the image of *rahmân* or to whichever of the images or whichever of the images of the Names, or whichever image it may be, invitation is to the One Ipseity and to nothing else, even though the one who invites the *rahmân* is specific in one way. However, there again there is not partnership since the one who invites God is in the same way specific, and there is no partnership even in that and this consideration is for the person who is veiled by the image, because by virtue of the existence of being veiled by the image there is no association in what he invites.

In this case, in what manner can association (*shirk*) be imagined at the level of a person witnessing? For from his vision and in his witnessing both the first way or second way of association is removed, since the person of witnessing is specialized in inviting the Ipseity of Uniqueness. Therefore there cannot ever be association (*shirk*) in those he invites because of the singularity of those he invited in the totality of the images, at his level. And all this is because the Essential Singularity encompasses the totality of images. Whichever image he

invites, it is all the same. (*Qul: ad'u allâh aw ad'u ar-rahmân.*) And invitation is the totality of the Identity (*huwiyah*) of the Unknowable Uniqueness which unites between the images of the Beautiful Names, and that which is called by all these Names is One, therefore there is no association (*shirk*) possible. The Shaykh said that this is the spirit of the matter, which means that these words and the Quranic quotes are nothing other than the spirit of the question of conjectural *shirk*. That is to say, there is no association (*shirk*) even though in the invitation of the inviter there is in some way specialization of inviting God or the *rahmân*; equally, since invitation to the Divinity or to the *rahmân* is invitation of the Oneness of the Ipseity, under these conditions there can be no association; equally, there is no association in the images of existence, and equally in the joint ownership (*mushâ'a*) of the One 'ayn there is no association. The *amr* is according to Unity. God knows.

Of the Wisdom of Religious Leadership (*al-ḥikmat al-imâmiyyah*) in the Word of Aaron

KNOW this, that certainly Aaron's being was from the Presence of *rahmût*, which means that Aaron's being was from the Presence of *rahmah* and he was named with mercy upon Moses, (*rahmût* is a superlative case of *rahmah* like *malakût* is a superlative case of *malak*), and it is said in the Quran: 'We gave Aaron to Moses from Our private *rahmah* as a prophet.' Indeed Aaron was older than Moses whereas Moses was bigger in prophethood than Aaron.

Now know like this, that Moses, upon him be peace, was the place of manifestation of the Majesty (*jalâl*). He was of irritable character and very solid in religious matters, and there was a defect in his speech so that his speech was not clear. Aaron was the place of manifestation of Beauty (*jamâl*) and he had a beautiful character and he had the quality of being agreeable to God (*murâdî*) and he was clear in his speech.

Moses asked of God for his brother to be joined to him in his prophethood so that together with Moses he could invite the people, and in helping Moses he would be conducive to making the people appreciate Moses more. So God gave him his brother Aaron from the private *rahmah* as a present, as a prophet, and he became his brother's helper, second, and manifestor; so the existence of Aaron became for Moses a mercy from God, and his prophethood also came from the special Mercy because Moses asked of God for Him to give Aaron as a prophet. And Aaron was older than Moses and the older brother has mercy and kindness (*shafîq*) and the mercy (*rahmah*) of brotherhood and motherhood (*umumiyyah*), because Moses and Aaron were from the same mother and father, and the utmost of natural affections is the mercy of motherhood, and Aaron was kind (*rahîm*) towards Moses even before his prophethood, but because he was not a prophet himself he was not a helper with him in inviting.

That is why Moses, upon him be peace, said the words: 'And join him in the order (*amr*) given to me as a prophet and demonstrator.'

Aaron's being became *rahmah* in the most complete manner, in the order of prophethood of Moses in inviting the people, and his becoming a prophet became mercy from the *haqq* for Moses.

When Aaron's prophethood happened from Mercy, Aaron said to Moses: 'Oh the son of my mother', because the mercy here was from the Presence of Mercy, and Aaron called on Moses through the intermediary of his mother. He did not call him through the intermediary of his father because *rahmah* is absolutely essential for the mother but not so for the father, and if there were not that mercy in the existence of the mother, she would not have the patience to start the education of her son; and after this Aaron said to Moses: 'Do not hold me by my head and hair, and do not let my enemies laugh at me.' This is a breath from all the breaths of Mercy.

Now let it be known like this, that Aaron was Moses' heir and replacement in the orders of prayer and praise after the separation of Moses from his people. And Aaron was heir and successor to Moses with prophethood and dispensing (*taṣarruf*) and with knowledge and state (*ḥâl*). Aaron was to Moses in the same station as the successors of Mohammed are to Mohammed after Mohammed's departing from this worldly emergence of the human race, because the successors of the Prophet by spiritual lineage, in this world have a right to the brotherhood of heirs.

That is why the Prophet used to show brotherly love to his successors who are his brothers, exactly like the deep affection of the brother who is not there to his own brother. And as in the *ḥadîth* it was said: 'Have the longing to meet my brothers', and those around him asked: 'Oh Envoy of God, are we not your brothers?' He said to them: 'No, you are my friends and relatives, and my brothers are those who believe in me without having seen me.' And the Envoy, upon him be peace, established thereby his brotherhood by pointing to the fact that they received from the same source as he does because they receive from the Divine Effusion (*fayḍ*) with the same pattern of good deeds which is the pattern of brotherhood from one and the same mine, like those who believe in him without having seen him (the Envoy), such as Abu Yazid-i-Bastami and Shaybân-i-Rayy, who are his successors, and other shaykhs like them who by virtue of hidden knowledge are successors and heirs, and also like Abu Hanîfah and Mâlik and Shâfi'i and people like them who are the people of individual judgement who are heirs and successors in outward knowledges, may God be pleased

with them all. (This is not a matter of these people interpreting, but means independent judgement derived from the same quality, connotation and meanings, furthering the inherent reality in different exegeses.) In short, these are successors who believed in the Envoy without having seen him with the sense of sight but the Envoy has yearning and longing for them. For these, in the Envoy, there is a pattern of goodness or beauty so that they become heirs by their relationship of brotherhood. There is the *ḥadīth* which says: 'Blessed are those who saw me and believed in me, and seven times blessed are those who believed in me and never saw me', and they are the brothers and successors who follow the pattern of goodness and receive from it through brotherhood, exactly like a brother who inherits from an affectionate brother after he has departed from this emergence.

Aaron was Moses' viceregent (*khalīfah*) and successor in the absence of Moses, and this is conditional successorship and viceregency because it is given by Moses. Therefore, in determination and in leadership Aaron was the viceregent of Moses. That is why Moses was angry with Aaron when Aaron, in the absence of Moses, did not determine over the *bani* Israel concerning the order of Sâmirî's calf. Aaron was patient under Moses' anger, so that when Moses seized Aaron by his hair and head in his anger, since Aaron was mercy upon Moses, he held his patience in order to deliver him from the oppression of the anger that had conquered him which thereby would have diminished him before his enemies since Aaron was older than Moses. His being seized by his younger brother by the hair and head would have become an impediment of Moses' invitation to the Truth in his prophethood. Since Aaron was appointed by God as a helper for the manifestation of Moses' prophethood and from his mercy upon Moses, he addressed Moses with the tongue of mercy and the mercy of love and by compassion. He said to him: 'Oh son of my mother', thus addressing Moses by the intermediary of their mother but not by their father, because the mother's compassion in the dispensing of affection is greater, and if her essential mercy and her natural love for her son had not been centralized in her nature, she would not have had the patience for the education of her child. Aaron, because of his mercy for Moses, said: 'Do not hold me by my hair and head and do not let my enemies laugh at me', so that the quality of anger was removed from Moses and any possible shame from the enemies was expelled. And all the words of Aaron, which have been mentioned, are of the breaths of Mercy from

the Merciful and is a breath upon Moses so that he was removed from the oppression and pain and was relieved.

And it is discernible from this that it was mercy for Moses, because this is exactly the same as what is indicated on the Tablets, which if Moses had glanced at them he would not have manifested upon Aaron with the same attributes. What was mentioned in the Tablets was guidance and mercy. And Aaron spoke to Moses with the same mercy that was on the Tablets. It is as if by the tongue of his attitude that Aaron took it from the Tablets and translated it to Moses. With these considerations, Aaron's words to Moses were mercy upon mercy. That which caused that anger to manifest from Moses for his brother Aaron was his lack of relating, that is to say, Moses' lack of establishing his vision on the Tablets which were in his hands. It is as if Moses had seen the Tablets but not with the sight of establishing them in his vision, and that is why anger had conquest over him. If he had looked upon the Tablets with the sight of establishing them in his vision, he would have certainly found the guidance and mercy that was written on them. What was written on the Tablets as guidance was what was happening of that order (*amr*) which caused Moses' anger. What was written there was the knowledge of the order of that calf and Sâmirî's misleading the tribe, and Aaron would have been acquitted from doubt of misleading, of which implication Aaron was free in reality. If Moses had looked at the Tablets with sight of establishing, he would have found therein the way that would have guided him to the proofs of his brother Aaron's being acquitted of any doubt, as he well knew that during his address to God, God had made him know, when he was still on the mountains in the presence of God, that Sâmirî had misled the *bani* Israel: 'Oh Moses, We have played a trick on Israel, and Sâmirî has led them astray.'

And Moses returned to his people in fury and very sad, and the mercy which was written in the Tablets was mercy upon his brother Aaron. Under these considerations, Moses would not have seized Aaron by the hair and head in front of his people since Moses was bigger than Aaron but Aaron was older than Moses; but all the same these words of Aaron were affection and mercy for Moses, because Aaron's prophethood is from Divine Mercy and consequently bestows affection and mercy in Aaron, and there could not be another form of speech from Aaron than his words to Moses: 'Oh the son of my mother', which are affectionate and full of mercy and which relieved

him from the oppression of anger and strengthened his prophethood and helped it. Because Moses had appeared among the people of veils and especially among the denying enemies with an order which made it impossible for the order of prophethood and which was against mercy and guidance, it would, among the weaker believers, impair their faith, and among the enemies would result in belligerence and grumbling and noisiness on the part of the enemies. In short, since Aaron was a gift of mercy to Moses, Aaron spoke these words by virtue of his mercy and affection for Moses, because the being of Aaron is solely and purely from the Divine Mercy and nothing other than mercy and affection can emanate from him.

From the words of Aaron, two faces became possible: one face is that having suffered from the rebelliousness of the enemies and since he was both affectionate and beneficent from the mercy in his own *nafs*, he said what he said to Moses to ease and calm the situation. The other face is that as he was the Divine mercy given to Moses with prophethood, Aaron spoke these words through that same mercy, so that through Aaron, Moses' enemies would not rise against him. And it is to eliminate the first face that the Shaykh here says: 'And this was affection upon Moses from Aaron.' When Moses came back and said to his brother: 'What prevented you when you saw them being misled, from following me?', Aaron answered: 'I was afraid that you might say that I divided the *bani* Israel.' What had happened was that a section of the *bani* Israel had actually followed Sâmirî and worshipped the calf, but another section of the *bani* Israel delayed their adoration of the calf, saying that they would ask Moses when he came back. The reason why the second section of the *bani* Israel delayed their adoration of the calf was because Sâmirî had told them that the calf was the God of Moses. In fact Aaron had told the *bani* Israel: 'You have been seduced, whereas your Lord is the Merciful; follow me and obey my order.' This second section of the *bani* Israel had answered: 'We shall stay until Moses comes and we shall ask him.' This section of the *bani* Israel had not believed in the calf by following Sâmirî, and they had delayed their belief subject to Moses' return and until they could ask him, though they continued to worship the calf. The first section were the followers of Sâmirî and these were divided from the others, and Aaron was afraid that this division in the *bani* Israel would be attributed to him, whether by Moses or by the tribes. Aaron's words are equally inherent of mercy to Moses in that they did not wish to

cause a brother believer to have a false doubt, in which case his fear was related to Moses, and in the other case that there were two different opinions among the *bani* Israel and he was afraid that they would accuse him of creating this division. There was also a section who had not deviated from their original way of praying and remained established in certainty (*yaqîn*). Aaron was afraid that if he had persisted, these divisions would each have accused him of dividing the *bani* Israel.

There were 600,000 in the tribe, and those who fell to the temptation of worshipping the calf were only 12,000 people. Under this consideration the *bani* Israel were divided into three sections. But Moses was angry with Aaron because Aaron did not forbid the *bani* Israel from worshipping the calf and did not determine among the *bani* Israel. That is why Moses said to Aaron: 'What prevented you . . .?' and seized him by the head and hair etc., and this is the obvious necessity of the situation.

But the Shaykh transposes the words to the level of reality and *tawhîd* and builds upon it by saying: But Moses knew the order (*amr*) better than Aaron, and when he saw that Aaron had not prevented the praying to the calf, he was angry with Aaron because he knew the order better, because indeed Moses knew better what Sâmirî and the people that followed him and prayed to the calf were worshipping, because he knew that in fact God the High had determined and decreed that nothing other than Himself should be worshipped and the High God never determined a thing to happen which did not happen. God had in fact determined that there will be worshipped no other thing than Him because there is no other than Him, and whatever thing there may be that in appearance is worshipped, and no matter what thing a worshipper worships, that worship in fact returns to the High God. But what was required here was Moses' transference to *tawhîd* and his consciousness of this which emanated from the High God's words to Moses when he was still in His presence: 'We have seduced your people after you left them, and Sâmirî has misled them.' The High God has attributed the seduction to Himself but has qualified Sâmirî with misleading. However, in the place of manifestation which is Sâmirî, that which was the misleader was the *haqq*. That is why Moses had answered: 'You seduce indeed, and mislead by it whom You wish, and guide whom You wish.' But Moses' accusation happened because of his brother Aaron's denial and because of the order which resulted

from his lack of assistance. That is to say, when the *bani* Israel worshipped the calf, Aaron denied this to them and did not help in the order of worshipping the calf, because the *‘ârîf* is that person who sees in everything the *ḥaqq*—perhaps even that he will see that the *ḥaqq* is the same as everything.

And Moses used to educate Aaron with the education of knowledge because Moses knew more than him, even though he was younger in age. That is to say, he used to educate Aaron with the education of Divine knowledge which was actualized for Aaron in the matter of Moses, because education does not happen except from the Absolute *rabb*. And in the same way, God used to educate Moses in the matter of Aaron, because God had made Aaron a mercy for Moses and had completed his prophethood by that, and his admonition was more forceful because of that.

The coming about of the *‘ayn* from Moses and the emanation of the throwing down of the Tablets with lack of establishing and the seizing of the hair of Aaron are all a very strong order, and for such a thing to happen for a person like Aaron, a subject, from a brother who was by age younger than him, is unexpected. But all the totality of the prophets, peace be upon them, are innocents. God does not act through their hands with a thing which is not obedience and wisdom, and also acts with such things that increase knowledge and gnosis (*‘ilm* and *ma‘rifah*). So in fact Moses points out and educates Aaron in such a way that Aaron understands the mysteries of the things that result from the worship of the calf, so that he become aware of the mystery of the worship of the calf which Moses knew and therefore told him.

The worship of the calf is a great mystery, and by virtue of their prophethood this has been removed from the prophets, and God teaches this to them only by virtue of their sainthood. And God was concerned with the education of Moses and Aaron, whether it be before a thing happened or whether it be after it happened; and it was because Moses was the educator of Aaron that when Aaron upon Moses' anger responded by the things he said as we have seen, having understood and taken notice of this situation of reality, Moses saw the reality of what came about outwardly and inwardly from Aaron and said: 'Lord, forgive me and my brother and enter us into Your Mercy, and You are the most Merciful of the Compassionates.' Having shown and explained to his people what errors emanated from them, he then returned to Sâmirî and said to him: 'According to your profession you

have built the image of a calf out of the trinkets. What is your aim and thought behind this?' In other words, from servanthood to an Absolute Divinity to the servanthood of the image of a calf of your own construction, what is your aim, what are you driving at? Why did you limit the Absolute Divinity to that image, and why did you particularize It in that image? What was your intention in making this phantom image from the trinkets belonging to the people (these trinkets the people of Moses had borrowed from the Egyptians—jewellery, money, etc.) so that you seized the hearts of the people by taking their belongings. Which means that by taking their belongings to bring about this phantom image, their hearts were inclined to this image, since naturally hearts incline to possessions, so to seize their hearts you took their belongings to build this phantom image.

Jesus, upon him be peace, said to the *bani* Israel: 'Oh people of Israel, each man's heart is where his belongings are, so you should imagine your belongings to be in the heavens so that your hearts be also in the heavens.' By this he meant that if you elevate up to the heavens your heart which follows your belongings, it may bring your hearts to be inclined to the heights of the heavens and thereby, perhaps, it will face in the heavens towards the Presences of the Divine Height and of Divine Names, and possessions become the treasures of the Names and the treasures of the Qualities which are of the spiritual and esoteric taste and the revelations of Divine effusion. Belongings were called belongings (*mâl*) because usually, essentially the heart is inclined (*mâ'il*) to it; therefore belongings are the greatest things in the hearts because in the hearts there results a neediness towards belongings; therefore the hearts in their essence are inclined towards possessions. However, images are not self-subsistent but are changing, are not established for ever but are perishable. They did not worship the calf because it was in the image of a calf, but because of their possessions (*mâl*) being in that image, and if Moses had not hurried to burn that image of the calf, that image of the calf would have by itself been removed.

The Divine resolution conquered Moses and he burnt the image of the calf, or the god of Sâmirî, in the fire, and he threw the ashes thereof into the open sea. When the revelation of the light of witnessing had come to Moses in the image of fire, that is to say, in the images of conquering and rulership and majesty which is the witnessing of the many in the manyness of one, this dominated him, and this is so

because the knowledges of Moses were the knowledges of discrimination (*furqân*) and were not unifying (*qur'ân*), and the quality of fire is to separate and decompose. In short, what dominated Moses was discrimination and distinguishing, and strength and manifestation and possession and conquering, and it was because of this mystery of the Light (*nûr*) of Divine Oneness that Moses had observed that fire (*nâr*) in the plurality of the bush. And he subjugated that image of the calf to the fire, which image of the calf Sâmirî had made into a divinity for those who worshipped it, so that that fire burnt that image and differentiated its component parts, just as Divine revelation differentiates each person upon which the High God causes revelation to happen. Because at the level of the manifestation of the prior, the subsequent does not subsist; rather it dissolves and becomes completely destroyed. Thus Moses, by burning the image of the calf, showed his people the picture of his burning the image of the sublime Countenance in creation, and the throwing of the ashes of the calf into the open sea is the picture of the disappearance of the recent at the level of the revelation of the ancient Lord. And understand.

Moses, before he burnt the image of the calf, had addressed himself to Sâmirî and had said to him: 'Now look at your divinity.' By this, Moses had called the calf a divinity, for the sake of instructing through showing the errors, because Moses knew that in fact that calf was one of the Divine symbols in which, in one way, the High God is manifest and revealed. Then Moses said: 'I shall surely burn the calf.'

The wisdom of his burning the calf is the following: Because there is animality in the human beings, there is the ability to dispense over the animality of the animals, because the High God subjugated to Man the animality of the animal when He said: 'We have subjugated to you all that which is in the heavens and the earth.' But the origin of the calf was not animal. It was not constructed through animal matter but with the solids which were the trinkets of the nation. Therefore, for Man, in the matter of animals being subject to him, this calf was more superior than the animal. Certainly this calf is different from the animals. It has no will like the animals have, and without will or objection it is established by virtue of the determination of the person who is dispensing over it. That is to say, although the animal is subjugated to Man, in the animal a kind of will exists. The solids, which are greater in obedience than the animal and qualified by their original nature, are qualified by total obedience; movement and will do not exist in them and they are

determined and dispensed by and obedient to and surrendered to the existent which dispenses them. Therefore for Man, in subjugation the calf is greater than the animal, and Moses burnt up that calf and threw its ashes into the open sea.

Now let it be known like this, that all the prophets are spiritual and Divine realities of Light; the 'pharaohs' on the other hand are images of the realities of darknesses and the powers of veiled *nufûs*. Therefore, there always exists opposition and animosity between the prophets and the 'pharaohs', just as there is constant opposition between intelligence and passion, and spirit and the devil. But the High God by the manifestation of the Unique by which is actualized (*muta'ayyin*) the primordially, manifested severally in these images of humanity each with a different revelation. Therefore He manifested with differences in the manifestation of the humans by virtue of the differences of the Divine Names in them. The manifestation of the totality of humanity are the Divine images, yet by virtue of the receptivity of their *a'yân* and the differences of their human nature each one of these in character and taste and their spirits became different, as also in their knowledge and their observation and their manner (*mashrab*) and their revelation. Just as in their forms and in their images and personal actualizations and in their appearance, their images became different, while in facing and in knowledge of the *ḥaqq*, and in Union, and in the principles of their many divided religions, they are united. Therefore, the totality of all the prophets and complete people in that degree, like one *nafs*, on one way, are the servants of one Lord (*rabb*) which is the Lord of all Lords. In short, God reveals Himself in each one of these according to the image of the Name which is victor (*ghâlib*) over them and which is determining over them.

Adam is the image of the Divine Manifestation and Seth is the image of the generous effusion and gift of Light. Idris is the image of the intellectual hallowing and Moses is the image of the rulership of conquest and power. That is why the determinations of conquest (*qahr*) and the witnessing of the revelation of Light in the image of fire were dominant over him. By virtue of state (*ḥâl*) and determination and praise and knowledge, and by virtue of the dominant wisdom over each prophet and viceregent, each one of these is distinguished one from the other. Consequently, each image of the totality of images existent in this world is symbolic in reality for the *ḥaqq*, One and

Unique. But differentiations of revelations become destroyed and inexistent at the level of manifestation of the total of Divine revelation, and when the revelation and manifestation of the *haqq* manifested in the mirror of Moses and became bigger and more awesome than the symbols of idolatry, then His sublimity of countenance burnt up the image of idolatry of the calf.

But the animal has will and purpose, and sometimes it happens that in certain demands one gets refusal; and if the animal shows its purpose and its will, it so happens that sometimes there appears from that animal rebellion for that which Man has demanded from it, and the animal will not execute the demand. But if in that animal the strength does not appear, or if the man's purpose coincides with the animal's purpose, then that animal will be obedient to that which the man has asked of it, just as a man is obedient to a man from whom he aims at getting something, for instance receiving a possession or some other purpose, a man becomes obedient to a man like himself. In other words, a man becomes obedient to another man for a purpose in such a situation where the man is superior to him in that object, like in knowledge or position or possession, or demanding a benefit from somebody else; in some certain cases this demand of possession is known as payment.

And this fact, that some people are elevated above other people, is obvious in the words of God where He says: 'We have elevated some of them above others in degrees so that some may have command over others', which means He has elevated some of them above others in degrees. That is, like in nourishment one is rich and one is poor, one is free and one subject, or in excellence of character where the truths have been brought to perfection. In these cases the height of the degrees depends on the beauty of character. He whose nature is good, his degree is high. So some have use over others in their needs, in their works, or a group among them use another group as their workers and they propose work to them, and the others because of what they receive as payment become obedient to them, so that one through work helps the other, and the one through possession helps the other. This image is the cause of the regulations of the worldly order, and sometimes the orders of the other world are ordered as a result of this.

For the human beings, no one can be commanded over by another who is equal to him, or equally, a man who is equal is not commandable over by another man for the purposes of that man, or for the

purposes of his *nafs*, and God does not give command over that man who is equal to the other. If there is command of one over the other, it is not from the point of view of his humanity but from the point of view of his animality, because two things that are the same oppose each other and they cannot be added together. The man who is superior in possession or position can dominate another man only through his humanity if the other man is in the place of humanity, but the man who is dominated because of fear or greed of possessions becomes dominated through his animality, and not through his humanity. A human being cannot be dominated by another human being except through there being fear in one or a lack, like the servant is afraid of the master and like the servant is lacking what the master has; in the same way, the people are afraid of the ruler and are lacking what the ruler has. In every case it is through his cupidity, like the poor tenant being greedy for the richness of the benefactor. In all these cases, in human beings fear and cupidity are from the side of his animality, which is the side of his being a human being, whereas his perfections are from the side of his being a man (*insân*) which is the side of his Lordship (*rubûbiyyah*). Having domination over something is from the side of being a man (*insân*), and being dominated is from the side of animality, and that man never becomes dominated who is equal to the other in his being a man (*insân*).

Do you not see therefore, covetousness which exists among the animals prevents them from obeying one the other and they do not become dominated by another, because the animals in animality are equal and those who are equal are in opposition and they cannot be dominated by one another. Since equals cannot be dominated by other equals, the High God said to Man: 'I have elevated some of you above others in degrees.' Consequently, the dominator is never in the same degree as the dominated. The dominator consequently is at a more elevated degree than the dominated, and this is due to the degrees in dominion and this means dominion results from difference in degrees.

Dominion is of two kinds: dominion of conquest (*qahr*) and dominion of state (*hâl*). One kind is where the dominator holds the dominated person under his conquest, like the master's dominion over his slave even though the slave is equal to the master in his humanity, or the dominion of the ruler upon the people even though the people are equal to the ruler in their humanity. In one way, the ruler has dominion over the people through his rulership and this domination is

domination of subjugation over the other, like the master subjugates and imposes upon his servant, and the ruler does the same to his people with such things that are not necessarily their desire.

The second kind of dominion is dominion by state like the dominion of the people upon their ruler, which ruler exists by the order of the people and by his protection from their enemies, protecting their goods and their lives and so on. All this is dominion of the people by their state over their ruler. In all this the people have dominion over their king, and he has to obey and serve them, and this dominion in reality is called dominion by degrees, which means that even though the people by their state dominate their ruler and use his services for their own affairs, in reality this dominion is the dominion of the degrees and is the degree of rulership. For instance, if a ruler was made to abdicate from his rulership, he would no more abide in the service of the people and he would no more be dominated by them, because the degree of rulership was determined over the ruler by the totality of this order, and because of that the king became the dominator according to this degree. If there is a king among kings who perseveres and works for his *nafs* for the protection of his people, and he works for his *nafs* so much that the possessions and the persons of his people are under protection, and that consequently the belongings and nourishment of the people actually belong to him and he uses their belongings and their persons in all their strengths to preserve himself from his personal enemies and he becomes a renowned ruler so that nobody can oppose him, the reward for this is only to the degree that he has worked for God.

There are, among the kings, certain kings who are cognizant of this order and know that in reality his dominion over his people is due to the degree of rulership, and that rulership over him, through the same degree of rulership, is rulership of the people. Consequently, he will be cognizant of the value of the people and their rights. In this case, God will give him his desert, according to this knowledge, in the same manner as knowledgeable people receive their desert. Equally then, the desert of a cognizant ruler like this is dependent upon God, because He is revealed by its revelation in the images of their works and the news of the works of His servants. In other words, he witnesses the *ḥaqq* which is revealed in them and by virtue of their manifestation, he will be under the dominion of that witnessing of the *ḥaqq* in them, and because of that his desert will be dependent upon God by the

manifestation of God with a total manifestation in his being and by God abiding in his renown.

The totality of the universe has dominion through state (*ḥâl*) over the existence of the One upon whom the name 'dominated' cannot be transcended, absolutized, because of all the images of the universe each image demands from the generous effusion of the *ḥaqq*, and *ḥaqq* gives that. He has imposed upon Himself the answering of each request. But the High God is every day in a different configuration, and these configurations in which the High God finds Himself at every instant and consequently in a different revelation, are the configurations of the servants. That which is revealed in the different configurations of the servants is the *ḥaqq* and this is what dominates the High God, because the different configurations in the servants is the *ḥaqq* which is revealed in reality by virtue of being; and it is no other. If it were another, then the *ḥaqq* would have been dominated by another, even if it is by virtue of revelation and configurations that He is called 'another'. Consequently, by virtue of revelation and configurations, He is manifest in the images of the universe and is only dominated by His own *nafs*.

Moses was made to have dominion over the calf because of the people of the calf, and because of this he had the ability to act with dominion over the calf, whereas Aaron's inability to prevent became a wisdom manifest from God in being (*wujûd*). Though he was preventing the people of *bani* Israel from worshipping the calf by word, Aaron did not have the strength to act this determination upon the people of the calf by action of rulership like Moses, who was able to have dominion over the calf to bring about the determination. Consequently, the lack of strength in Aaron to bring about the action of the determination became a manifested wisdom in being, because God is worshipped in every image, even though after being worshipped that image is wrong and eliminated. That image could never have been eliminated at the level of its worshippers unless it was first dressed in Divinity, just as Moses, in the case of the image of the calf, burnt it after it was worshipped and dressed in the image of Divinity and eliminated. In other words, because the High God is worshipped in every image in all the different varieties of the creation, there is not left one variety which has not been worshipped, either by indirect worship (*ta'ilah*) or by worship of dominion. That is to say, *ḥaqq*, which is the Absolute worshipped (*ma'bûd-i-muṭlaq*), when He manifested with

the Light of being and with the revelation of the effusion of being in any one variety of the high creatures and the low creatures, in each variety, even in the image of each person, it became absolutely necessary that He should be worshipped in every single image of the images of the universe, either by worship of Divinity like the worshippers of idols, trees, stones, the sun and the moon, stars and the calf, because Divinity is of the Ipseity for the Being of the *ḥaqq*, hence in whatever form the Being of the *ḥaqq* is manifest or is revealed, then in that image He will be worshipped, or by the worship of dominion like the people's worship of possessions and people of position and rank, and there is no name in common usage for the worship of dominion because this is reserved for the indirect worship. Whatever the case, servanthood is realized in these two kinds, because if somebody's (or something's) love and rulership is manifest in your heart, you are that person's servant.

For the person who understands the *ḥaqq* in every image there is no doubt that the *ḥaqq* is the one that is prayed to in every image, whereas at the same time nothing has been worshipped in this universe except after it was adorned with elevation at the level of the worshipper and after it manifested in the heart of the worshipper with a certain degree. That is to say, because each one of what is worshipped from among the things of the universe was worshipped after being dressed with a certain elevation in the heart of the worshipper and each manifested in the heart of the worshipper in certain degrees, the High *ḥaqq* became for us that which is called 'elevated in degrees' (*raffī ad-darajât*). That is to say, He called His own *nafs* 'elevated in degrees' and did not say 'elevated in one degree', because the things that are worshipped in different degrees all have a servant and the thing that is worshipped according to reality in that degree is the *ḥaqq*. In other words, at the level of the worshipper which is in that degree, it is after *ḥaqq* becomes dressed by elevation that the worshipper worships *ḥaqq*. Consequently, *ḥaqq* becomes elevated in degrees.

The High God pluralized the degrees in one *ʿayn* because certainly the High God decreed and determined that nothing else be worshipped in the many different degrees, and He gave it in each degree a place of Divine revelation so that the *ḥaqq* is worshipped in that degree.

The greatest and highest of these places of revelation in which the *ḥaqq* has been worshipped is passion (*hawâ*). In fact the High God has said: 'Do you not see those who have taken their passion as their

God?' Passion is the greatest of what is worshipped, because no thing is worshipped except because of passion. So in the things that are worshipped, passion is fluent as all things are worshipped by it and as the worship of all things is manifested in the passion; consequently, passion is the greatest of what is worshipped. However, passion cannot be worshipped except by its own essence, that is to say, except by passion itself which is animated in the heart of the worshipper by the love for that which is worshipped. Here the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, points out that indirect worship (*ta'ilah*) or dominion (*taskhîr*) does not happen for the worshipper, no matter who it be, except because of that servant's passion. Consequently, nothing has been worshipped except passion. Passion for the person who witnesses things other than the Being of the *ḥaqq* is an idol or false god (*tâghûr*). But at the level of the gnostic, passion is the greatest of the places of revelation wherein the *ḥaqq* has been worshipped, and passion is of eternity interior and its 'ayn is never manifested except in the idols and by virtue of the different number of things worshipped in the totality of the degrees of the idols.

'And I say:

And the truth of passion is that passion is the cause
of passion;

If passion is not in the heart passion would not be
worshipped.'

(*Wa ḥaqq al hawâ inn-al hawâ sabab al hawâ,
falawla al hawâ fi-l qalb ma'abad al hawâ.*)

The interpretation is this: because passion is the greatest of all that is worshipped, because it is that which is worshipped by its own ipseity, then I say that the Divine Love that the *ḥaqq* has for Its own Ipseity and by the reality of the singularity of Love, indeed passion which is the singularity of His Love is the cause of the partial passion, which is manifest in every actualization because of the descent of *ḥaqq*'s images of manifestation. If the Divine passion and the interior spiritual love were not established in the heart, the passion which manifests in the *nafs* would not have been worshipped, because the manifest passion of the *nafs* is the same as the interior (*bâṭin*) spiritual passion which has descended from the revelation in the heart to the revelation in the *nafs*, with all the retinue of the passion's singularity in the totality. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, says in his

Futûhât: 'I have witnessed the passion in certain insights (*kashf*) in manifestation with the Divinity sitting on His Throne and all His worshippers afraid for Him and of Him and standing around Him; I have never witnessed anything worshipped in the images of immanence greater than that.'

Do you not see the Divine Knowledge of things; what thing made it more complete and perfect and how complete the Divine Knowledge is and how the High God has completed knowledge for that person who worshipped his own passion which he took for his divinity? The High God misled him on knowledge and yet being misled is perplexity (*hayrah*), so the High God completed and perfected by means of perplexity which is misleading. And the explanation of this completion or misleading is this: the High God knew this worshipper, or else the value is this, the High God knew that this worshipper did not worship except his own passion. that is to say, He knew the person who was worshipping passion knew that he did not worship except his own passion by virtue of submitting to his passion in that which his passion orders him, even though he worshipped it knowing that that thing was worshipping a person from among persons. Yet the worshipper's worship of the High God equally came about from the side of passion like the worship of other things, because the value is such that if the passion had not happened from the side of the Holy Divinity (and passion is will with a kind of love from among different varieties of love, be it love of salvation or degrees, or the love of the perfection of the *nafs* or the love of the qualities of the *haqq*, or the love for the Ipseity), the worshipper would not have worshipped God, and would not have preferred Him above any other. That is to say, as the worshipper's worship of the High God is from passion, and since passion itself is nothing other than the will of love to a kind of image from among the spiritual images, consequently he who has worshipped an image from among the images of the universe and considers that image as Divinity, does not consider that as Divinity except by passion. Thus the worshipper is never released from being condemned to the rulership of his passion, and whatever he worships, he worships with his passion.

Some have transcended love to the High God by looking at reality, because in reality love and the lover and the beloved is one existent, and there is no difference between them except by consideration, exactly like knowledge, the knower and the known are the same. Thus the rule of *tawhîd* is maintained, and in the manifestation or the

interior (*ẓâhir* or *bâtin*) nothing exists except the One Being of the *ḥaqq* by consideration of manifestation and revelation. There is no witnessing in the words. After this, as the High God knew that among the worshippers the things that are worshipped in the immanence and beliefs are different, or equally that the person who worships his passion knew that that which is worshipped is various among the worshippers, then each worshipper worships one order and accuses the worshipper of another order of denial, and that worshipper in whose level a warning has happened becomes aimless among the various things that are worshipped, and cannot make private to himself what to worship from among other things to be worshipped, because among all the things that are worshipped, passion is united because of the singularity of passion; in fact passion is a singular '*ayn* among all the worshippers. And the difference between union and singularity is this. that union necessitates duality and singularity does not necessitate this. The High God misled that worshipper, that is to say, He brought him into perplexity according to knowledge so that each worshipper did not in fact worship anything other than his passion and in his worship use that, and it is the same whether his passion is coincidental with a permissible order or not. And the perfect gnostic is this person who observes each thing worshipped as a place of revelation of the *ḥaqq* wherein the *ḥaqq* is worshipped. That is to say, the complete gnostic (*ʿârîf*) observes the *ḥaqq* in His Ipseity, *ghaniyy* from the images of plurality, and with His Qualities and revelations observes Him as manifest and revealed in all the manifestations of being and images of things worshipped. The plurality of things worshipped does not render him perplexed; rather he observes each thing worshipped as a place of Divine revelation where the *ḥaqq* is worshipped, and by virtue of each place of revelation he himself also observes the *ḥaqq* in there, and since each thing worshipped is a place of Divine revelation, all the worshippers called the things worshipped a divinity. That is to say, the worshippers of idols, all of them, called what they worshipped a divinity. That is to say, all worshippers called the things they worshipped as their 'divinity' by the private name of that existent which is the name of the thing worshipped, whether it be stone, or tree, or animal, or person, or angel. That is to say, each calls what he worships 'divinity', and if, for example, what he worships is a stone and he is questioned: 'Is this not a stone?', he will answer that it is stone, because in his mind he dresses the divinity with the appellation

of what the thing is called, and it is the same thing in the case of trees and animals and other things worshipped. In other words, each worshipper for instance calls by the name 'stone' his idol which is of stone; this name concerning that idol is the name of its personality by some way of manifestation, and secondly, by virtue of the *mâhiyyah* which is actualized (*muta'ayyin*), by a personal manifestation (*ta'ayyun*).

Divinity is a degree of totality and of unification, but the one who worships a stone or a wood etc., imagines that Divinity is at the level of his idol, be it of wood or stone; that is to say, he believes that what he worships is actualized at that degree, for the eye of this special worshipper, whose eye is resident on that idol in this specialized place of revelation, is devoted to this specialized place of revelation. However, in reality, Divinity is the place of revelation of the *ḥaqq*. In other words, each worshipper imagines that the Divinity which is the degree of totality of elevation is the degree of his own idol and that his idol is actualized in that degree, and that degree is equally actualized in his idol. But the truth is, the degree of Divinity that is imagined in each thing worshipped is not Absolute Divinity. This is the place of revelation of the *ḥaqq* for the vision of this special worshipper, whose eye is resident upon his idol in this special place of revelation, wherein the *ḥaqq* is revealed in a special face and the worshipper thinks that that special face is the elevated degree. Consequently, this worshipper becomes veiled by the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* which is actualized in that special place of revelation, and he has been veiled from the face of the *ḥaqq* because he only witnessed the manifestation because his *nafs* and his manifestation is of a personal and partial variety. Had the worshipper been free and divorced from the regulations of the manifestation (*ta'ayyun*), he would have witnessed only the manifestation of the face of the *ḥaqq* which would have been revealed in his own idol, and if he had observed the face of the *ḥaqq* in his idol, he would have equally observed in the totality of things worshipped that the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself and manifests Himself therein in a face, and he would not have devoted to one specific place of revelation that elevated degree and the Reality, or the totality of unification, unless that specific place of revelation be the place of revelation of the *insân-i-kâmil*, which is the place of totality of manifestation and receptivity wherein that degree of Divine unification manifests with the largeness of unification and with the totality of manifestation.

Some people who do not know the speech of ignorance, or some people who know the order (*amr*) to be like this but use the speech of ignorance, or some people who have no idea of what the speech of ignorance is, say: 'We do not worship the idols except so that they bring us near to God.' Thereby they call what they worship 'idols', and they established for the *haqq* oneness, and they did not worship the idols with the belief in their divinity, but rather they worship them as a means of coming to God, yet when they name their idols they call them God. They have no consciousness of the fact that if what they worship is named God, had there been Divinity in what they worshipped, the idols would have been the reality of God. What meaning, then, is there in saying that they are the means of arriving at God, since they are not conscious of the fact that that which leads to the High God is not an idol? So all these worshippers do not know the meaning of Divinity because of their nature, and are veiled by the manifestations. Consequently, they have stopped at the level of images of plurality, so much so that those who stop at worshipping stones and woods and things of the images of the immanence said of the Prophet: 'Did the Envoy take all the several idols as one Divinity, and does he invite to the one God? Indeed, this is a very surprising thing.' Yet they do not deny the oneness of Divinity. They were only surprised at the invitation to worship only one Divinity. These are the people who have remained and are established at the level of plurality of images, and they have established themselves at the level of the relationship of images to the Divine.

So the worshippers took an image from the images of immanence, and related Divinity to that image and remained at the level of that image. Some also considered the numerousness of the idols by virtue of the number of the worshippers even though each one of these worshippers denied the other one's idol, because each people took as Divinity a different image, and these people, when they were invited by the Prophet to come to the worship of one God, said to each other in surprise: 'How is it that the Envoy unites all these different idols into one and asks us to worship that?', because in reality a number of idols do not make one God. The person of Oneness of the *haqq* is higher removed than plurality and numerousness (number). To invite to one God over and above the number of divinities is to go beyond all this and is to invite to the degree of Divinity which is the beginning of everything.

It is by their words that they established that there was one God, at their level, and they believed it and these other idols were a means of approach to that one God. And when the Prophet witnessed their ability to believe in one God, he invited them to one God. In short, the one God was known at their level even though not witnessed, because they knew that the images they witnessed were stone and were nothing of Divinity, and it was because of this, because they knew that Divinity was not in the stone, wood, etc., that it became an obligation upon God to prevent them from worshipping wood and stones. That is why God said to the Prophet: 'Tell them, you name what your idols are because you worship them, but that which is called by the Name *Allâh* is not worthy of being worshipped by anything other than One Existence.' When these people are questioned on the names of their divinities, they call the idols by their appropriate names, and they say that the stone is stone and the tree is tree etc., and hence by their own words they become bound, because idols which are stone, wood or star are not fit to be worshipped.

Yet, those who are gnostics and know the order either through Divine knowledge or insight (*kashf*) from the Lord, manifest over the people who worship images of the universe by denial because, in reality, their degrees in knowledge bestow on them that they are outwardly, according to the necessities of the times, believers in the determinations of the prophet of the time and follow that prophet because of whom they have become believers. The saints who verify the Reality and the complete gnostics know the order of Being as it is, and are witnesses of the Oneness of the Being of the *ḥaqq* in the manifestations of immanence, and have insight to the fact that whatever is worshipped among all the things that are worshipped is in reality the real God; yet they manifest over the people who worship the numerous idols that are derived from the images of the universe, because the degree of their Divine knowledge bestows on them that they should be in accordance with the determinations of the prophet who is the saint of the times, and be in accordance with his laws, and they believe in that even though in reality they are gnostics by insight (*kashf*), because the prophets and envoys have limits of religious law and determinations of religion. The manifested rulership of these is caused by the necessity of the manifesting and the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* and of knowledge and worship necessitated by the origination of the emergence of the completion of Man.

In other words, the saints and gnostics who are existent during the period of a prophet's prophethood are subject to the determination of that prophet in the manifestation of their dealings and in the manifestation of determinations of their laws, and are legalized by these laws and are helpers in the religion of the prophet, and in their interior they are under the determination of what arrives from God and the Lord's revelation. Consequently, they are saints and gnostics according to the reality and the interior, but outwardly they are called believers in the prophets. But the gnostics are the worshippers of the era, because each era is a revelation from among the revelations of the Divinity. The Great God, in each era, reveals Himself with certain qualities; that is why era (*dahr*) is one of the Divine Names. The Prophet said: 'Do not revile the era, because the era, it is God' (*la tasubbu dahr fa-in al dahr hu allâh*). The High God in every moment is revealed in a different revelation and upon the people the quality of that era is dominant, that quality with which the God reveals Himself to that time. The envoy who is ordained for that time is the greatest place of manifestation for the completion of that quality. The High God reveals Himself to that era with that quality from the place of revelation of that envoy and that envoy is the spirit of that time. Consequently, the envoy invites the people to the *haqq* which is revealed at that time. Obedience to him is obedience to the *haqq* and that is why it is necessary to obey the envoy and to believe in him.

Those who are gnostics of the *haqq* in every place of manifestation witness the *haqq* in this, in the most complete manner, and give It Its due, and with the reality of subjectivity submit to It. Equally, the intercourse of the gnostics with the *haqq* is according to the era and this is some of the many faces (*wujûh*). Consequently, the gnostics are manifest with the appearance of denial even though they well knew that in reality the worshippers of idols did not worship their outward appearances but their *a'yân*. Rather, they worshipped God in those images by virtue of a determination from the King of revelations, which revelation they recognize through their idols. In other words, though the reality in the ways and witnessing of the gnostics is like this, those who worshipped the idols worshipped the High God in the images of the idols. In each image the High God is revealed and the rulership of one revelation is therein dominant. Consequently, according to what they discerned from what they worshipped of the account of the King of revelations they worshipped no other than the High God. Yet in

spite of their knowledge of all this they would still appear with denial so as to coincide with the laws of the envoy and concord with him since that envoy is the ruler of the time. But the believer who denies the open worship of the idols has no knowledge that the *ḥaqq* is revealed in the places of revelation which are these idols. He does not know that the *ḥaqq* is revealed in the idols, and he remains ignorant of the fact that the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself in idols, and does not understand, and the complete gnostic, who is the heir of the prophets and envoys, has veiled from these people the fact that it is the *ḥaqq* which is manifested in the places of manifestation which are the idols, even though he sees that they worship the *ḥaqq* in the places of manifestation which are the idols. The reason why the gnostic veils this determination is because of magnification (*ta'zîm*) and beneficence (*takrîm*) and majesty (*ijlâl*), and he also veils the *ḥaqq* because he wants to transcend the *ḥaqq* from actualizing and immanencing which is the totality of the knowledge of the people who are veiled, and again to be able to complete those from among the population who are inclined towards following (*sulûk*) and have the aptitude to face from the relative to the Absolute, so that by refraining from the images of relativity, they are guided to the meanings of Absoluteness, and so that they unite between the Absolute and the relative.

Consequently, the gnostic ordered the people of veils who were worshipping idols to refrain from these images because the envoy of the era refrained from these images and did not legalize the worship of the *ḥaqq* in those images. Therefore, the gnostic ordered them to distance themselves from the images in order to agree with the envoy and also because he is desirous of the increasing of the Divine Love towards them, and so that the love of God becomes realized through their agreement with the prophet, because God said: 'Tell them, if you love God, follow me so that God loves you.' By this, God relegates the love of God to following the envoy, and makes the following of the envoy the result of the love of God. And because the *'ârif* is desirous of the excess of the Divine Love, which is extra Divine Love, which is subject to following the envoy, he follows the envoy and orders to refrain from the worship of the idols since the envoy also refrains from this.

The envoy invites to the God, the Absolute Being, because that is what is necessary for being and for nourishment, and for all orders and aims it is necessary to appeal to That; and He needs no one, and He is

known by virtue of totality (*ijmâl*) and absoluteness (*iṭlâq*) and by virtue of relativity and differentiation. His Ipseity is not witnessed, and equally eyes do not discern Him; on the contrary, He discerns the eyes, because of His fluency and generosity in the *a'yân* of things. Eyes do not discern even their own spirits which organize their being alive as images in the manifestation of themselves. Therefore, if even the spirits which so devise the images and shapes are invisible to the eyes, how can the eyes discern the *ḥaqq* which is the interior (*bâṭin*) of these spirits? *Ḥaqq* is subtle (*latîf*) beyond the discernment of eyes and visions, and is *khabîr* of the interior and forms, and to be fully informed (*khubr*) is taste, that is to say, it comes about with taste; and taste is revelation and revelation results in images. It is beyond a doubt where the images are concerned, that the *ḥaqq* is revealed in them, and it is beyond a doubt that the *ḥaqq* is revealed in the images. Consequently, without a doubt, a person who witnesses the *ḥaqq* in the images where the *ḥaqq* has revealed Itself, will certainly worship the *ḥaqq* according to his passion, because if a person sees the *ḥaqq* revealed in an image, whatever the image may be, he inclines to that, and in passion (*hawâ*) and cognosis (*'urf*) inclination is of the *nafs*.

Therefore, witnessing is not possible except by revelation, and revelation does not happen except in images. Consequently, for the *ḥaqq* there does not exist witnessed worship except by the inclination of the *nafs*, and without a doubt, the inclination to an image is concordant to that image and that is the inclination of the passion. Consequently, passion became necessary for worship and something is not worshipped except by passion. That is to say, if you have understood and contained what we have mentioned to you, this is how the order is. The purpose and aim of the road (*sabîl*) is to end at the degree of Divinity which unites all the union of Divine Names. All the different roads and the various ways return to Him and end in Him, and God guides whom He wishes to the straight path.

The Wisdom of Eminence
(*al-ḥikmat al-'ulûwiyyah*)
in the Word of Moses

THE aspect of the specification of the High Wisdom to the Mosaic Word has been mentioned in the index, and the Shaykh (R.A.) brought first the wisdom of the death of the children to other determinations of Moses, because the children which were killed for Moses are like his powers and parts, and other determinations are like his necessities. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) started with the killing of the children, and said: **The wisdom of the killing of the children because of Moses is to visit him with succour of life of all that were killed because of him**, which means that all the children in Israel were killed because of Moses, and the wisdom of this is that the death of each child for the sake of Moses is to help with its life, and belongs with its life to Moses for whom they were killed. Now, Oh those who like Moses, the one spoken to by God in the Tor of revelation, requesting the vision of Beauty and burnt in the Light of prostrations of the *jalâl* and the revelation of Beauty, and, Oh those who are covered with the being spoken to by the Oneness, drowned in the Sea of Oneness of the *ḥaqq* and in the Sea of the Effusion of the Ipseity of Uniqueness, You, the complete and perfect gnostic and the receptive knower, know it like this, that the Ipseity of the God and the Being of the Unknowable Absolute, in consideration of Its Absoluteness and non-individuation, is One Reality, and is transcendent from praise, qualification, Name and affairs, attributions and plurality and numerality of individuation, and is not determined over by any determination or seasoned by any quality, nor pictured by any praise. But in the First *ta'ayyun*, which is the collectivity of the totality of the individuations of the Divine Names and container in itself of all the receptive potentialities of possibilities of being, He descended for the purpose of manifesting the non-existent Names and the potentialities of conjectural receptivities, which are the potentialities of the Unknowable and the realities of the Ipseity which are in annihilation in His Ipseity, with total manifesting and manifestation for witnessing and making witness in its totality and in detail with the

Breath of the *rahmân* and the effusion and revelation of Lordship. He became individuated by virtue of the non-brought-about essential inclinations of the unknown and unknowable potentialities, due to which the Names and Qualities and affairs and attributions of individuation became differentiated one from the other with the relative differentiation, and equally, the Divine Essential revelations and the breaths of the Oneness of the *rahmân* became individuated with the inexistent receptivities and the conjectural established potentialities. However, the individuations of the Names of the inexistent potentialities, by virtue of their essential aptitude, became individuated in the expanse of circumscription with total and partial individuation. Thus, some of the Names, by virtue of their total circumscription, collect in themselves the totality of the Divine Names which are individuated in the degree of Divinity and the Presence of Knowledge of the First *ta'ayyun*, and they contain and are prevalent over all their determinations and effects. Like *Allâh* and like *rahmân*: 'Say: Pray to *Allâh* or pray to the *rahmân*. To whichever you pray, to Him belong the Beautiful Names.' Thus, underneath each total Name there is individuated one or some partial Divine Names, where that total Name is like a leader and governor over them, and they are like the servants to them and people led by them. They are like the limbs and parts of the spiritual and bodily powers in the human emergence. When that total Name wishes to manifest one determination from among its determinations, it will order whichever Name is specialized for that determination from among the partial Names which are like its servants, and will manifest by its place of manifestation. For example, the human-kind, when it wishes to see something, it orders the eye, and if it wishes to hear something, it orders the ear. Thus the man, by means of his hearing and sight, sees the thing to be seen and hears the thing to be heard.

According to the determination of the *ḥadīth*: 'First what God created is the Intellect', and: 'First what God created is my light', and: 'First what God created is the Pen', the first created is the High Pen which is the place of manifestation of the First *ta'ayyun*, because the First *ta'ayyun* is collective, relative and knowledgeable *ta'ayyun*, and the High Pen is collective, synthesizing, existential and essential *ta'ayyun*. The single spirits, the intellects and total selves, are collected and are synthesized in it, and are equally differentiated by relative differentiation. Just as sons of Man are synthesized and collected

in Adam (S.A.) who is the Father of Man. The degree of the Preserved Tablets which is the second degree of the High Pen, which is referred to as the Total Self, is where the spirits and the intellect which were in full power in the High Pen become detailed in relation to the High Pen, when the High Pen descends to it (i.e. the degree of the Preserved Tablets). Here, through differentiation of being, they become distinguished one from the other and become individuated with total and partial *ta'ayyun*.

Thus, the spirits of the prophets and envoys and of the total and perfect saints, being the places of manifestation of the totality of the collectivity of the Names which are individuated in the Divine Knowledge, are individuated with total individuation in the degree of universe of spirits and Preserved Tablets, because they are mirrors and places of manifestation for the total Names. Thus, each of the spirits from among the total spirits, by virtue of its collectivity and the expanse of the circle of its circumference, comprise and are prevalent over the partial spirits which are manifested, which spirits are individuated in their degree of totality. They are in the human emergence like the spiritual and bodily powers and corporeal limbs, and they are like servants and subjects and peoples in the universe. Thus, certain partial spirits are like the powers and parts and subjects and servants of certain total spirits, who are individuated by that one's individuation and who are existent by that one's existence. Thus, just as this partial spirit which is under the circumference of that total spirit and is under his determination in the higher universes and the universes of the spirits, and equally, as they are under the dominion of that certain total Name, they are still under its determination when they have reached the sensory bodies in the universe of senses and witnessing, just like the peoples and subjects of prophets and envoys, and the soldiers and populaces of sultans and kings. It is equally so in the isthmuses of the other world. 'All people are invited by their leaders.' Each prophet is in accordance with the plurality of his people and the totality of the spirituality of the width of its religion, and the totality of this spirituality is in consequence of the unknowableness of his reality and the collectivity of the totality of the Divine Name to which he is the place of manifestation. The strength of invitation in the prophecy of each prophet is in consequence of the aptitude of his people and their multiplicity. When the Divine Will appertains to the rising of an envoy which is specific to it, in accordance with the

necessities of each era, then, under one consideration, the people and the subject of the total spirit of that prophet, and under another consideration, some of the partial spirits which are the places of manifestation of his total spirit and his powers and members, applies, with the being and the degrees of remaining in being in the universe of spirits and with the fluency of the total spirit in them, to the body of the senses and the humour of the elements prior to it, or sometimes at the same time as the application of that total spirit emanates from his creation. Thus, when God the High wished to manifest the determinations and the miracles and the observation of the Mosaic Word and ordained the high and the low causes which are of the movements of the heavens and the positions of the spheres which are comprised in the number of the matters of the universe and marriages of the elements and which are prepared for this manifestation, and as the time for the manifestation of Moses (S.A.) was close, the Knower of everything and the Complete Knower and the Completely Informed and the Completely Wise knew that in the spirit of Moses there was no power apparent to resist the destruction and dominion of the Pharaoh and the people of the Pharaoh which are comprised in the spirit of the Pharaoh, who was under the collectivity of the manifestation of dominion and destruction of Awe and Majesty (*jalâl*), and further, as the spirits which were in his circumference were, even though individuated in his universe and named with the individuations of spirits, yet who in most cases would not complete the degrees of existence and who were lacking in comparison with plant spirits, animal spirits and human spirits, and equally, as the strength which was in them was weak in help and succour, being only in the potential, it became necessary for the Wisdom of the Most Wise and the Art of the Most Knowledgeable that some of the spirits who were in the circumference of the total spirit of Moses should manifest in the image of the human spirit which is the speaking self in the degree of humanity, which is the last degree of being of the animal spirit which is in the animal degree, and the plant spirit which is in the plant degree, so that they take all the power and possession which was treasured in all the degrees and obtained the power to help Moses and return again to help Moses. Consequently, the children who were killed from among the children of Israel—thinking that they might be Moses at the time of the birth of Moses (S.A.)—were a variety of spirits which was under the determination of his people and helpers and were in the circumference of the spirit of Moses (S.A.).

Thus, before the individuation of the prophetic, perfect, complete humour of Moses (S.A.), the humours which were receptive spirits and realities which were in the spirit of Moses, were individuated and appertained to his spirit and bodies. Although he was present in the station of his own spirituality according to the totality of the Mosaic spirit, he became manifested and individuated by virtue of the place of manifestation in the place of manifestation of those spirits. However, they were not sufficient to resist the Pharaoh without Moses and his total spirit. They had contained only the power to assist Moses in the manifestation of the totality and perfections of Moses, and the wise and knowledgeable ones of the Copts had already informed the Pharaoh that at that time there would be a son born from the Israelites, through whose hands would come about the destruction of his possessions and of himself. Consequently, the Pharaoh, who was afraid of God's *qada'* and determination, decreed the killing of the children which were born to the Israelites, but did not realize that if God decreed the destruction of his person and dissemination of his estate through the hands of somebody whom God willed to live, he could not find victory over that person. Consequently, by the order of the Pharaoh they killed all the children born from the Israelites at that time, thinking that they might be Moses, that is to say, that one of them might be the child through whose hands would be destroyed and disseminated Pharaoh and his dominion. Consequently, the Pharaoh became the helper of the child who would destroy him and disseminate his estate, by killing all the children of Israel, and helped along in his own destruction, because the spirits of those children killed reverted all to the universe of the spirit of Moses, and were collected together at the level of the spirit of Moses and were comprised in it. Thus, the spirit of Moses became strengthened by those spirits, and the qualities of those spirits became collected in him and he became strengthened with their powers. Thus the spirit of Moses became the collectivity and the place of collection of all those spirits, and as has been mentioned before, this is the wisdom of extension of help to Moses from those spirits.

Disregarding the fact that in a certain aspect those spirits, separating themselves in a certain aspect from the universe of the Moses spirit, that they manifested in the human image which is the end of the traverse of spirits in manifestation, and reached the degree of the human spirit which is the last degree of the degrees of spirits, and were manifested and revealed in the image of Man which is created in

the image of God, and reached the degree of Man, acquiring further perfections in the degrees of being, they returned to their origin with help and with further completion and perfection, without being contaminated with the aggressions of the *nafs* in their manifesting of the human image, with their original subtleties and cleanliness and their original nature which was present in them potentially, which perfection and completion was not manifest in them before the degree of extension of the Moses spirit, because that spirit, mentioned first and last, is within the circumference of the spirit of Moses, and they could not have helped him had they not returned to the spirit of Moses with that further perfection and completion as mentioned. Had there been enough power in them to help and bar before this extension (of the Moses spirit), they would have helped. However, it became manifest that those manifested spirits and the conquering lights could help Moses only when they were comprised in the Moses spirit with further perfections and completions and superior life. Thus, when the temper and humour of Moses became arranged and individuated, then God the High blew into him the total, collective and all-inclusive Mosaic spirit. That is why the acts of Moses (S.A.) were all in the totality and perfection of clarity, and the fact that he manifested with the 'white hand' was due to the manifestation in him of the lights of those spirits. Thus, the order and honour of the affairs of God the High became manifest and the imperial proof became heightened, and His extent and power conquered. Thus He destroyed the Pharaoh and his surroundings and friends and helpers. Now, the Divine Wisdom necessitated the killing of the children of Israel because of Moses, so that the lives of those people belonged to Moses for help, because the manifestation of different spirits in one circumference and total one nature and humour is more collective, more complete, more beneficial and more general than if they were to manifest separately. That is why it was prescribed by the Prophet that there should be a collectivity of consultation in the religious law. If those children were not killed, their spiritual subtlety and spiritual life would have been many and varied by virtue of plurality. Thus, because they were children killed, their spirit was collected in Moses. **Because the killing was due to the fact that they were Moses, and there is not after that** (that is to say, in the Divine Presence), **ignorance**. Because in fact each child was killed for being Moses, but there is no ignorance in the Divine Presence. The Veritable Actor, who is the God, is both knowledgeable and wise to

the fact that the children that were killed were the detailed image of Moses, and when they were killed their spirits belonged to Moses for help. Thus God, by virtue of His Knowledge, is Most Wise where it concerns their being killed, and He determined that they should be killed, in the matter of Pharaoh, and killed them, and had the information that if those children were not killed and that their spirits and life did not belong to Moses and give him strength, the destruction of Pharaoh and his estate could not be accomplished by Moses and be manifested. Thus the *ḥaqq*, who is the only one in his estate and singularized in his determination, is the Absolute Actor, and whatever order emanates in his estate, either collectively or in detail, is certainly built according to His Wisdom, and that whatever action manifests in being is built upon His Knowledge and in accordance with His manner of action (*mashî'a*). In this sentence it is also possible to use the words: '... there is not after that, ignorance' to appertain to Pharaoh's determination that each child of the children of Israel is Moses. In other words, there is no ignorance in the determination of Pharaoh for having each child killed as Moses, as they were detailed images of Moses. Yet ignorance exists in particularizing Mosesness to each image, as well as in knowing in which way each image is Moses, and in knowing that the life of each child killed belonged to Moses and that their killing is succour to Moses. **Without a doubt their life is for Moses, meaning the life of the ones killed for his sake, and these were manifested lives in their natural constitution, not defiled by the desires of the self, therefore they were according to the natural original constitution.** The life of each child that was killed because of Moses does, without a doubt, belong to Moses according to the necessities of wisdom and knowledge. The life which belongs to Moses is life which is manifested according to the original nature, which has not been polluted with the pollutions of qualifications of the humankind, and not defiled. Rather perhaps that life is manifest and established according to the nature of the 'Yea' (*balâ*). 'The nature of God, according to which is the nature of Man.' Although the spirits of those children killed were attached to the images of nature and to the elemental humour, they were manifested according to original purity of spiritual light and nature of primordial eternal *islâm*—'All born are born according to the nature of *islâm*'—and were killed before they were qualified with the qualities of animality and before the human qualities and the desires of nature had manifested in their bodies and

determined over them. As those manifested spirits and conquering lights were not yet defiled by desires of the *nafs*, the spirit which was their origin belonged to and reached Moses.

Another aspect of the fact that the spirit of Moses was detailed in the images of the spirits of the killed ones, and at the level of the child being killed their life belonging to Moses, is this, that the happening of this order is like the fruit-bearing tree, where although in the origin the tree was one being, it manifests in the image of several or many branches. Due to the multiplicity of its branches, the effusion which is present in the origin of the tree which is fluent in all its branches, flows according to weakness, and when this is observed in the rarity of its fruit and a certain dryness is observed in its branches, the wise gardener and the well-informed teacher cuts off all the branches, even some of the live branches, even if he cut all the branches surrounding it, the effusion and strength which is differentiated among the many branches inclines usually to manifest and flow with strength, and finding the branches cut off retracts into its origin, and the effusion that was in all the branches becomes collected in the tree, and the tree being fortified with that strength its fruit-bearing is extended and produces and gives superior fruit. However, there is no inability in the Power of the *haqq* the High that it should give after this strange manipulation which He can give even before, yet the *haqq* the High, who is in His Ipseity Rich beyond Need of the universes in His Ipseity, diffuses existence due to the place in accordance with the necessities of His Wisdom. Thus, the Mosaic spirit is likened to the tree, and the children who were killed are likened to the branches of the tree, where those branches are the being of the tree and their effusion is derived from the tree. Thus the Divine effusion and the Lordly revelation which is particular to the spirit of Moses from the Most Holy Effusion, flowing in the children which are likened to the branches of the tree, and the origin of their spirits being the spirit of Moses and they receiving the Divine effusion from the Mosaic spirit, and as the Mosaic effusion is manifold and fluent and is flowing with total fluency, consequently, the strength of the spirit of Moses being in weakness, the Wisdom of the Most Wise and Most Knowledgeable, wishing to manifest the Mosaic Word according to totality and perfection, killed those children. Thus, the Mosaic effusion, which was fluent in their existences, returned in accordance with totality and perfection to the spirit of Moses and was collected in there. In this manner, succour was made to come to Moses.

The Lordly leader and the self-subsistently wise, Mohammed bin 'Ali Tirmidhi (R.A.), tells of a *ḥadīth* in his 'Book of Seals', which he refers to Abdu Rahman bin Sirahiyya who said: 'It came to me in a dream of the battle, and when the deaths of Ja'far and Zayd and Ibn Rawāhah were mentioned, the friends of the Prophet (S.A.) wept a lot, and him to whom is the most superior of *ṣalawāt* and *salām* said: "Do not weep". and said: "Why should we weep that our friends and the most honoured among us and the people of superior quality from among us are killed?" And the S.A. said: "Do not weep, because my people is likenable to a garden which has an owner . . . who feeds generally by waves and waves, and to the very end feeds most generously all of us, and lengthens its fruits, and when God resurrects us He brings about for us successors from the son of Mary better than His apostles.'" And again, in the same way, he (Tirmidhi) relates, referring to Sahl, son of Rabi'ah, who says: 'The Envoy (S.A.) said: "In that there are heirs (loins), heirs and heirs, people from among my companions, man and woman, who enter the paradise without reckoning." After that he continued: "And the last ones with them when they joined them, and He is the Dear and the Wise. This is superiority from God which He gives to whom He pleases, and God is the giver of superiority and grandeur." And the leader of the believers, 'Ali, whose face God has rendered generous, said when he spoke to some of his friends at the victory over the people of Jamal: "We should be pleased if our friend so-and-so was of our witnesses (the ones who fell in battle in defence of religion), and if they fall from among our soldiers, these people are from among the friends of the people and of the abode (depth of the heart) of the women, and time flows immediately from them and strengthens in them the certitude.'" And Moses was the totality of the lives of those who were killed on the account that they were him, and all that was of gift for those who were killed was no other than what was in the aptitude of their spirits, was in Moses. Thus Moses became the totality of the lives of the children of Israel who were killed for being taken for Moses, and the totality of their spiritual life and spiritual strength was collected in Moses. Thus, whatever was prepared for that one killed, as Divine gifts, which was particular to the aptitude of its spirit, that is to say, whatever was obtained as gift in the aptitude of that spirit, that thing of gifts existed in Moses, because whatever was prepared for them did not manifest in them because they were killed, and as their spirits became comprised in the spirit of

Moses, those things manifested in totality in Moses. And this (that is to say, the killing of the children and the collection of their life in Moses) is **Divine particularity for Moses which has not happened for anyone before him**, which means that the children of Israel that were killed because of Moses, and the collection of their lives which is collected in Moses, and their being help for him, is a Divine specialty for the case of Moses (S.A.), and never happened for any prophet before Moses. The determination of Moses is many, and we will, if the High God so wishes, explain of these in this chapter to the extent of the Divine order which was given and which is in my mind, and it is that this is the first of what was shown to me of it of this chapter. This means: this is the first of the predications that I have taken by being shown from the Mohammedian image in the dream (*mubashshirah*—the name given to veridic dreams by which glad tidings are brought to select people). Thus, this complete and perfect heir (the Shaykh R.A. himself) stops at the level of the limit to which he is assigned due to his relationship to the completion and perfection of the spirit of the Prophet, and speaks with neither more nor less. Consequently, whatever happens in this area of conviction and proclamation belongs to the Envoy (S.A.). **Moses was not born except as being the collectivity of multiple spirits which collect all the active powers**, which means to say that these spirits are like the active powers for him which the emergence of humankind collects in itself. This can also be read, considering certain grammatical consequences, as: in no other way Moses was born except that he was the collectivity of many spirits by collecting the active powers. Thus, the many spirits which were collected in Moses happened at the station of the active powers. **Because the small acts in the big. Do you not see the child in the big by its particularity, and the big comes down to him from his state of leadership and plays with it and engages in baby-talk with him.** In fact the small is active in the big by dispensing in him. Do you not look at the child who is active and effective in the big by its particularity of childhood? Thus the big child descends from his degree of leadership to the child's degree and plays its game with him and speaks to the child in its language and dandles him. **And appears to it according to his intelligence, and he is under his subjection but he does not know it. Then it engages him in his own education and protection and to seek and enquire after its own affairs and to its familiarization, so that its own chest is not constricted.** Which means that the big appears to the child to the limit of the child's

intelligence. Thus the big is under the enchantment of the small, and the big does not know that this is happening. After that, the small employs the grown-up for his own instruction and for his own protection and for the arrangement of his own affairs and for his familiarization. In short, he occupies him for himself so that his own chest is not constricted. All this is of the action of the small upon the big and this is due to the strength of the station, because the small is of recent date with his Lord because he is of recent immanence, and the big is further away, and he who is closer to God compels the one who is further away from God, like the special angels who are brought into closeness with Him subjugate those who are further away. All these above-mentioned dispensings (*taṣarruf*) are of the action and effect which the small has on the big, and this action and effect is from the strength of the station of the small, because in reality the small is of recent date to his Lord because in fact the small is of recent immanence, which means that his immanencing from his Lord is closer in time, whereas the big is further away in time from the small in being immanenced. Thus, whoever is closer to God subjugates the person who is further away from God, like the special ones of the race of angels, who, due to their closeness to God the High, subjugate the angels who are further away from God, and other creatures. It is also possible to read this sentence with the diacritical sign of *kasra*, which would then mean: the special people who are close to the king subjugate those who are further away from the king, like the viziers and leaders subjugate the commonality of people.

Now, let it be known like this, that closeness and distance, close and far, are two relationships to God which have been individuated from two stations of Divinity, according to which two stations felicity and wretchedness are made into degrees. Thus, that person who has the least of intermediacy of states, that person becomes the closest, like the First *ta'ayyun*, because the First *ta'ayyun* is the first degree that manifests from the Absolute Unknowable. Thus, he subjects the person who has not this closeness, due to his closeness to his existensor, like the prophets and saints who subjugate their people and their followers. Whichever person is the possessor of the uniqueness of the totality of the Divine completeness and perfection, that person is closer than the one over whom the determinations of plurality are predominant, and he subjugates that person, but the closeness and distance which happens in this position is due to the recent arrival of

the revelation of the *ḥaqq* and the freshness in consequence of time, and due to the continuance in time and distance in time of the revelation of the *ḥaqq*. Thus the little children, who are closest and latter in manifestation to their existensor, have, so to speak, manifest and individuate in their image, the *ḥaqq*, and subjugate to itself the people who have been for a long while and had to abide long and whose distance has been extended for a length in the reception of the Divine revelation. Thus the small subjugates the big, and the big serves him. However, the complete and perfect gnostic, which is big and who is, in comparison to the child's closeness to the *ḥaqq*, at the end of closeness, if he descends to the degree of the child, which is small, that is from the Bounty (*'inâyah*) and Mercy of God, and thus this is a different order. In consideration of it being different, however, does not oppose what we have mentioned above. The Envoy (S.A.) used to expose his self to the rain when it came down, and uncovered his head so that it would be reached by it, and used to say because it is of recent date with its Lord. And look at this gnosis of God from this prophet, what is its cause, what is it that elevates it, and what is it that makes it most evident (manifest, conspicuous), that in fact the rain subjects the most superior of mankind by its closeness from its Lord, and this was like the descending of the Messenger with inspiration to him. The Shaykh (R.A.) here gives an example of how the small is effective upon the big and how the recent of date subjects the big, by showing that the Envoy (S.A.) used to expose his noble body to the rain and used to open up his blessed head to the rain so that it would be attained by the water of the rain, and when he was asked of this wisdom he would answer: 'Indeed its time is closer to its Lord', that is to say, in separating away from its Lord it was shorter in time. Thus, you look at this total gnosis of the Envoy (S.A.), and what thing caused him and heightened him and made him most evident. Thus the rain which is of recent date subjected the most superior of mankind because it had closeness to its Lord. The rain, in relationship to the Envoy (S.A.), was like the Messenger who used to come down with inspiration to the Envoy (S.A.), that is to say, like the Angel, because the Envoy used to witness in the rain the image of the Divine knowledge which is the life of the spirit, which knowledge used to come down to him through the agency of the Messenger, but knowledge manifested in the image of rain because relationship is established between knowledge and rain, because knowledge causes the life of the spirits. The S.A. said:

‘Whoever happens to be with knowledge is alive, and he never dies.’ In the same way, water causes life in the bodies, and the exposition of the Envoy (S.A.) to the rain is indicative of the consideration of the effusion of the spirit which is effused over the complete and perfect spirit, and the uncovering of his head points to the removal of all impediment to the descent of the Lordly knowledge and the Divine effusion. **Inviting him by its essence, by its state.** Thus, like the Angel who descends with Divine inspiration, the rain invited the Envoy (S.A.) with the tongue of its state, with its essence, which descended in the image of knowledge and life, and he exposed himself to it so as to be attained by it in what its Lord had given to him. Thus, the Envoy (S.A.) exposed himself to the rain so that in respect of his being an envoy, from the rain he would be attained by that which the rain brought to him from its Lord. Now what it brought is this meaning that all things are alive by it, because rain is the life of all bodies. Thus the rain is the image of life and knowledge and Divine effusion which is the nourishment and food of the spirit. **Had there not resulted for him of Divine benefit in what attained to him, he would not have exposed himself to it. And this envoyship is the envoyship of water by which God brought life to everything. So understand!** If there had been no Divine benefit resultant for the Envoy (S.A.) from rain, by what attained him of rain, the Envoy (S.A.) would not have exposed himself to it. Thus, this envoyship is the envoyship of water by which God the High created everything that is alive. Thus the envoyship of water is this, that as every live thing receives life from water, and as water is the image of life, the life of the spirits of the prophets and saints is the water of the life of Divine effusion. Consequently, the rains of the Divine effusion are constantly descending from the Presences of the heavens of the Divine Names. Consequently, remove that thing which veils and prevents the reception of that Divine effusion, and be communicated by it. So understand this subtle meaning. The manifest spirits, which are like the active powers, remain according to the nature of light. The Divine Names and all the heavenly spirits which are the beginnings of those spirits, became attached to the spirit of Moses. The Divine Names and all the heavenly spirits is from whence they were resurrected. Thus, these spirits were not separated from Moses, just as these active powers were not separated from Man in the emergence of mankind, and the Divine Names and the total spirits which were the origin of these spirits equally were not removed from aspecting

Moses, because the Divine Names which are the origins of those spirits are equally under the circumference of the collectivity of the totality of the Divine Names which are the realities and the source of effusion and the circumference and the origin of Moses. Thus, when the human spirit which is not soiled with the natural and elemental soilings returns to its origin with its original nature and purity of light and holiness, it does not go beyond its own origin, otherwise it would certainly have been necessary that the branch is different to its origin. Consequently, this is the wisdom of the collection of the spirits of the children killed at the level of the spirit of Moses.

As to the wisdom of depositing it in the ark and throwing it upon the waters, the ark is his human nature (*nâsût*), and the waters what results in him of knowledge by means of this form by what it (the knowledge) bestows upon him of strength of speculative thought and strength of the senses and imagination (*khayâl*), none of which comes about, or things of this kind, in this human *nafs* except by the existence of this elemental form, and when this happens to the *nafs* in this form and orders it with dispensing in it and planning its direction, God then brings to it these strengths as tools by which he reaches to what God has willed of these in this planning of the direction of this ark in which there is tranquillity for the Lord. The wisdom of the mother of Moses depositing Moses, in accordance with the order of the Lord, into the ark and throwing the ark upon the waters is this, that the ark is the *nâsût* of Moses and his human image, and this is as if it were the image of depositing the spirit of Moses into his form. The waters are, equally, the image of the knowledge which results in Moses by means of this form, the knowledge which was bestowed by the power of speculative thought and the powers of the senses and imagination, where these, and other powers of this sort, do not result in the human *nafs* except by the existence of this elemental form. When the human *nafs* becomes present in this elemental form and reaches it and is appointed and ordered to dispense in this form and to plan the direction of this form, God the High makes this power of speculative reasoning and the powers of the senses and imagination into tools for this *nafs*, such tools with which the *nafs* reaches that completion and perfection by them, which in fact is what God the High willed of him (expected him) to do, that is, in the planning of the direction of this ark in which there is tranquillity for the Lord. In other words, in the planning of the direction of the ark which comprises the tranquillity of the Lord, the completion and perfection

that God willed (expected) of the *nafs* is reached by the tools of those powers, and it is through these tools that perfection and completion results for the *nafs*.

The wisdom of the ark being the tranquillity of the Lord in this elemental form is this: because the human form is the last degree of manifestation and is the most complete, most collective, most prevalent and the largest of the Divine places of manifestation, because it is created according to the Divine image. Perfection and completion results at the degrees of manifesting and manifestation, of witnessing and making and causing to be witness.

The Divine Wills and the Essential Love and the meanings of the Unknowable and total orders never cease to descend and to be motivated, and He never ceases to manifest His revelations and His effusion over their receptive *a'yân* in the Lordships of all the degrees of existence, and never ceases to observe and be aspected to them with Lordship. Thus this human form, which is created according to the Divine image, is created in consequence of its receptivity of the totality of the immanential and all the Divine perfections and completions. When the human *nafs* and the human spirit descends to the degree of reflection and of polishing which is the most perfect and complete human degree, and when it attains to the degree of God's revelation in him with complete and partial manifestation, then in that form there is tranquillity for the Lordships of the Names, and tranquillity results to that being of total Divine manifestation. Thus, in this way, the word 'tranquillity' is derived from the word 'tranquil', but if it is to be considered that it is derived from the word of the same root, 'abode' (*maskan*), then it points to the perfect and complete human heart which results in the human form, which is the place of reflection of the Divine image and the repair (home) of the Lordly revelations. The Shaykh (R.A.) says in his *Risalat al-Ghawthiyya*, recounting from Khaṭṭab: 'The *ḥaqq* to the *ghawth*, which is His own Self, said: "Tell Me, Oh *ghawth*", and it answered: "*Labbayka*, Oh Lord of the Throne." "Tell Me if there was anything manifested like My manifestation in Man." It said: "Oh Lord, is it not a dwelling for You?" And He said: "It is the abode of the abodes, and there is no abode for Me other than Man."'

And threw into the water with it, so that there would result in him by these powers the science of knowledge, and He made it known to him by this that if it is that the spirit that directs him is the king, that he does

not direct him except by it, and He made of these powers of abiding his close connections in this *nâsût* which is called by the appellation 'the ark' in the chapter of pointing at and determination. Such is the direction of God of the universe, which He does not direct except by it, or by its image, and He does not direct it except by it. The image of Moses being thrown upon the waters, with the ark is the image of Moses being put into the ark of the body and throwing of the ark of the body upon the waters of knowledge, so that Moses be manifested according to the science of knowledge with these powers. Thus God the High made it known to Moses by throwing Moses in the ark upon the waters that the reality is such that if the spirit which directs the body is the ruler, yet in fact that ruler cannot direct it except by means of that form, by that body, which is the ark. Thus, God the High made these powers which happen in the spirit in this *nâsût* close relations, and it is because of this that this *nâsût* is interpreted as the ark. The direction of the universe by God is also in this same way, which He did not direct except by the universe or by the image of the universe. The image of the universe is the Beautiful Names. That is why after this the Shaykh (R.A.) again annotates it by saying: 'He did not direct it except by itself.' The child depends on the being of the progenitor, and the things that are motivated upon the motives, and what is conditional upon the conditions, and the causes upon the effects, and what is guided upon the guides, and the things proved upon their proofs, and what is verified upon their realities, and all this in the universe is the planning of the direction of the *ḥaqq* in this, which He does not direct except by it. That is to say, the fact that God directs the universe by its own self is like all these conditions enumerated above, and the whole of this direction is from the universe. That is to say, He caused some of the universe to be the means of directing some others of the universe, and this planning of direction is what the *ḥaqq* has made to be the direction in the universe. Thus, the God did not plan the direction of the universe except again by the being of the universe, just as, for example, the existence of the child depends on the existence of the parents. In other words, He brings into existence the child through the place of manifestation of the parent. Thus, He plans the direction of the universe again by the place of manifestation of the universe. As to our words 'or by its image', I mean the image of the universe. By that I mean the Beautiful Names and the high Qualities by which God is called and by which He is qualified. The Beautiful Names and high Qualities, which are the

images of the universe revealed in the mirrors of the receptive *a'yân*, are the images which are reflected and revealed in the *a'yân*. The universe has no other image or quiddity than the images of the Beautiful Names. Thus, what is meant by the image of the universe is the image of its interior reality which is, in the images of the Names and Qualities, the individuated images of the One Existent, because they are established and remain with the *a'yân* of the Names and Qualities, also because they are meanings and realities. The images of sensory persons are engravings and forms and individuations, and they are exchangeable; the interior images of individuations are the spirits for the manifested sensory images. Thus, God the High did not plan the direction of the manifest image of the universe except by the interior image of the universe, where that interior image is manifested and revealed in this manifest image, and He plans its direction and its establishment with the successive revelations. And He manifests in them the latter images which are in the powers of the manifest images. Thus, the planning of the direction of the universe by its image is planning the exterior image of each part of the parts of the universe, which is individuation, by the images of the Names which are the individuated images which are interior, and planning the universe by its self is planning some latter parts by some parts of the parts of the universe. What there is of difference between those two planning of directions is this. **There has not come to us one Name with which He is called where we did not find the meaning of such a Name and its spirit in the universe,** which means, those Divine Names with which God the High has called Himself and taught us. The meaning and the spirit of each Name is that Name's Quality which differentiates it from another Name, and the spirits and meanings of all these Names, like the Qualities of Life and Knowledge and Will and Ability, are all established in the universe. Thus, the Ipseity of Uniqueness is Rich beyond Need of the universes. However, by virtue of their differentiation from the Ipseity of Uniqueness, the Divine Names and Qualities are not rich beyond need of the universes. The Names are revealed in the images of the receptivity of the *a'yân*. **In the same way, God does not plan the direction of the universe except by the image of the universe.** Thus again, the High God did not plan the direction of the universe except by its own image, that is, the image of the universe, which means, by the Divine Names which are the images of the universe. Thus the High God plans the direction of the universe with the universe, just as He

planned the direction of the child by the parents, and the effects by the causes, or, in short, by the image of the universe, that is to say, by the Divine Names, like Alive, Knower, Willer, Creator, the Potent, the Nourisher, by which God the High has called His own *nafs*. In consideration of the Reality of the *ḥaqḥ*, these Names we have mentioned and these Qualities are the spirits of such Names. These Qualities are existent in the circumference of the universe as alive, as knower and known, will and the portion of achievement and the creature and the one that is nourished. Thus, God the High did not plan the direction of the universe except by its image, which are the images which are the collective assembly of the Divine Names. That is why the Prophet (S.A.) said in the creation of Man, who is the plan (and in certain copies: he is the prototype), the collector of all the qualificatives of the Divine Presence, which are the Ipseity, the Qualities and the actions: 'Because God created Adam in His own image', and His image is no other than the Divine Presence, which means that God the High due to His planning the direction of the universe by the universe, the Envoy (S.A.) said concerning Adam, who is the prototype, who by being the collector of all the qualificatives of the Divine Presence, which are the Ipseity, the Qualities and the actions: 'In that God created Adam in His own image.' However, the image of God the High is no other than the Divine Presence, which is the collectivity of the Ipseity, the Qualities and actions. And He brought about in this noble epitome, who is the Perfect and Complete Man, the totality of the realities of the Divine Names, that which is outside of him in the detailed greater universe. Thus God the High, having brought about the totality of the Divine Names in this noble epitome which is the Perfect Man, and equally, having brought about the realities of things which are outside Man in the detailed bigger universe, that is to say, He brought about the realities of things which are collected in the detailed bigger universe, which are things which by their image are outside of Man, in the Man itself, because although the parts of the universe and earth and elements and minerals and plants and classes of animals do not exist by image or by individual existence in the Man, yet the realities of these things do exist in Man, which realities are like spirits and speaking *nafs* for these images, where they exist with them. Thus, considering that the Perfect and Complete Man is the synthesis and the result of the bigger universe by its image, he contains all the Qualities and the totality of the realities of the bigger universe. Thus, the totality of the Divine Names

and Lordly Qualities which are collected in the Presence of Divinity, and all realities and essences which are collected in the greater universe, God the High collected in the Complete and Perfect Man. And He brought this as the spirit for the universe, and subjected to it the high and the low because of the completion of his image, which means that God the High made the Perfect and Complete Man to be the spirit of the universe, just as He made the speaking self the spirit for the human image. Thus, due to the completion and perfection of the image of its collectivity, He made the high and the low subject to him, because the image of the Complete and Perfect Man collects in itself the Divine image and the image of the universe. Thus, because of the perfection and completion and the collectivity of the image, He subjected to him (the Perfect Man) the heavens and the earth, the higher spirits and lower persons, and the universe of the spirits and the universe of witnessing, and the high Divine Names of necessarily-so-ness and the low places of manifestation of immanential possibilities. And it is such that there is not a thing in the universe who does not praise God with its *ḥamd*. In the same way, there is not a thing of the universe where it is not subjected to this Man, as he bestows on them the reality of his image. Thus, there is not a thing which is a part of the universe which does not ever praise God with the tongue of *ḥamd*. In the same way, there is not a thing of the universe where that thing is not subjected to this Man, because the reality of the image of collectivity of Man bestows the fact that the universe must be subjected to it because his reality is collective reality. His relationship to the universe is like the spiritual and sensory powers in the human emergence and the relationship of the spirit to the limbs and members, in the same way as all the parts and realities are fluent in the universe. Consequently, the universe comes under its subjection and servanthood. And the Shaykh compared the subjection of the universe to the *ḥamd* and praise (*tasbīḥ*) of the universe to the *ḥaqq*. Because with the words: 'And there is not a thing that does not praise Him by its *ḥamd*' it is established that the things and singularities of the universe are established according to their praise of the universe. Nothing praises God except that thing which is alive, and the life of the universe is the being of the Perfect and Complete Man which is its spirit. Consequently, as all things praise God, in the same way all things are under the subjugation of the Perfect and Complete Man because their succour and life arrives to them from him. It is rather like this, that as all things are under his

subjugation, the being which is individuated in his being praises God. And He said: 'And We have subjugated to you that which is in the heavens and that which is in the earth, all which is of it', and all that there is in the universe is under the subjugation of Man. He who has known this as his own knowledge, he is the Perfect and Complete Man, and he who does not know this due to his ignorance, he is the animal man. Thus, it is because the universe is under the subjugation of Man that God the High said: 'We have subjugated to you that which is in the heavens and that which is in the earth, all which is of it.' That is to say, God the High addressed each single person which is individuated in the degree of completion, and said to them: 'God the High has subjected to you the totality of the creation which is in the heavens and the earth.' Consequently, the high and the low of the totality of the things which are created and existent in the universe is under the subjugation of Man. And anyone who has known this subjugation, that person is a knower, and that person is the Perfect and Complete Man, and the person who has not known this subjugation and is ignorant of it is the animal man, because the person who is not the Perfect Man has no gnosis of the degree of the Perfect Man and that the universe is under his subjugation and is in servanthood to him, and the person who is ignorant of this is not a man. He is animal man, because there is nothing in him other than the quality of animality of the perfection and completion of Man. Thus, he who is not in gnosis of the degree of the Perfect and Complete Man is in the degree of animality and does not know the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, how can he have gnosis of the *ḥaqq* when he is not in gnosis of the Viceregency of God who is created according to the image of the *ḥaqq*, and is sensitive and witnessed by it? And the image of Moses being placed in the ark upon the waters is the image of annihilation in the apparent, and in the interior it was like the image of salvation for him from being killed, and he became alive, just as the *nafs* becomes alive with knowledge from the death of ignorance. Thus Moses, who was under the determination of death, became alive by being deposited on the waters, and was saved from the killing of the people of Pharaoh, just as the selves which are dead with the death of ignorance become alive with knowledge, and death becomes liberated from ignorance. As the High said: 'Or is not that he who was dead', that is, by ignorance, 'We have made him alive', that is to say, with knowledge, 'and We brought to him light by which he walks among people', and that is (light) guidance. He was like the one in darknesses, and that

is misguidance, and he is not outside that, and forever he is not guided, because indeed the order in itself has no limit at which to stop, and guidance is that which guides Man to perplexity (*hayrah*) and he knows that the order is perplexity. The Shaykh (R.A.), bringing testimonial for the above-mentioned claim, says that the God said: Is the order not like this, that the person who is dead with the death of ignorance, We made him alive with knowledge, and that We made knowledge a light for him with which he walks among the people, and that light is the light of guidance, and the counterpart of a person who walks with the light of knowledge among people is like the person who is in the dark-nesses, and the darkness is for him misguidance and he is not outside of these dark-nesses. That is to say, he will never be guided to the straight path, because in reality there is no limit in the order itself so that he would stop at that limit. Thus guidance is the guidance of Man to perplexity which is the praiseworthy perplexity, and the dark-nesses are the perplexity of ignorance, the despicable perplexity. And perplexity is agitation and movement, and movement is life, and it has no peace and no death. That is to say, as perplexity is agitation and movement it requires movement and pain, and movement necessitates life. Consequently, for that which is in movement there is no tranquillity. Consequently, there is no death for it, because that which is in movement is alive. And being and no non-existence, which means, referring to perplexity, that the order is being, therefore it has no non-existence. That is to say, the life which is alive with knowledge is forever alive and remaining with eternity, and it cannot have inexistence. The being might also be in reference to life rather than to perplexity, as movement necessitates life. To him upon whom is peace said: 'Who is made alive with knowledge never dies.' It is also grammatically allowable that the words 'movement' and 'being' both refer to perplexity. And in this way in the water in which there is the life and the movement of the earth, (as testified by) His words: 'and it quivered and bore', (and in) His words: 'and it increased and brought forth', (and in) His words: 'and grew comely from each pair', that is to say, it did not bring forth except from that which is like it, that is to say, of its nature, just like being a pair has partnership in it in what is born from it and manifests from it. This refers to the words like He said: 'Or is it not that he who was dead, We have made him alive with knowledge', that is to say, as life is existent in knowledge, life is equally existent in that which is water, through which results the life and the movement of the earth, and the

life and movement of the earth is clearly indicated in the words of God the High: 'and it quivered'. Thus the words 'and it quivered' point at the movement of the earth, that is to say, the earth moved. The earth is like the human body, and the bearing of the earth is God the High's word 'increased', that is to say, pointing at it, that is to say, to become increased, like the bearing of a human being, and the birth of the earth is the words of God the High: 'and grew comely from each pair', that is to say, this points at the birth of the earth, which means the earth did not bear anything other than which was similar to it, that is to say, things that are natural like itself. This pairing, which is partnership, resulted for the earth by that which is born from the earth and manifested from it. Thus, the movement which happens in the earth which is one existent, and the coming about of growth and birth and the establishment of natural things which are the same thing as the earth, and the coming about of pairing, which is partnership, none of these things are outside the earth itself, and results from those things which are manifested and born from it. The manifesting of Eve from Adam which is one being, who is like himself a natural and elemental thing, is how there came about being a pair for Adam, yet Eve is no other than the being of Adam, and the manifestation of the sons of Adam from Eve is equally like this. Consequently, the ordering and direction of the universe is again through the universe, and plurality and pairship happen again in one being, and the name 'universe' contains the totality of the multiplicity of images. In this way, to the Being of the *ḥaqq* there came to be (established) multiplicity and the numerality of Names, that He was thus and thus, by that which manifested from it in the universe, which require by its emergence the realities of the Divine Names. By 'thus and thus' one means the Names like the *raḥmân*, *raḥîm*, the Creator, the Nourisher and others like this, like in the different genres or categories of the universe, which by their emergence require from what manifests from God the realities of the Divine Names. For the One Being of God the plurality and numerality of the Divine Names are established by the universe which manifests from God Himself, where, with the emergence of the universe, they require the realities of the Divine Names. Thus, the plurality in the Being of the *ḥaqq* happened through the existence of the universe which manifested from God. In the same way, it is not other than the Being of the *ḥaqq* and it is not outside of it. Consequently, the emergence of the universe, which manifested from God, made a pair of the Uniqueness

of the Being of the *ḥaqq*. And was established by it, referring to the establishment of the plurality for the One Being of the *ḥaqq*. The universe is the one that worships, the one that establishes Lordship and the one that is created, which necessitates the Being of the Divinity, the Lordship and the Creator. Thus, with the existence of the universe the Divine Names became realized and the plurality of Names became established by manifesting in the places of manifestation of beings of the universe their effects and Names of determinations. Before the coming into being of the universe the plurality of the Names were in the Intellect of the One Ipseity, and this was called the relationships of plurality and the Uniqueness of plurality, and the Shaykh added: **and the Uniqueness of plurality is contrary to it.** That is to say, the Uniqueness of plurality is contrary to the plurality of the Names in the Being of the *ḥaqq* through the bringing about of the universe, because the knowledgeable images of the Names which are in mentation in the Uniqueness are manifested and revealed by virtue of the places of manifestation, and it is the places of manifestation that manifest the actions and effects and predicaments which are potentially in the Names. The plurality of Uniqueness is the plurality which is in mentation in the One Ipseity due to the extrinsic, relative, theoretical and speculative individuations, which plurality is only mental images and which have no existence outside, and their mentation does not depend upon the exterior potentialities. They are only in mentation in the Divine Knowledge in complementary opposition to the non-existent receptive potentialities. This degree is the degree of the Presence of Oneness, the Presence of Divinity and the Divine Knowledge, where the Names are differentiated one from the other by the differentiation of relationship, and they are not differentiated by external differentiation and existential differentiation like the differentiations that happen in the universe. The plurality which happens in the universe is real plurality, and the plurality which happens in the Presence of Knowledge is the plurality of relationships. In this way the subject of the sentence 'plurality of Uniqueness' is the word 'contrary', because the plurality which is in mentation does not depend on the universe, but the plurality of Names which is manifested by the universe is dependent on the universe. **God was in fact Unique of potential (*aḥadiyyatu-l-'ayn*) by virtue of His Ipseity.** That is to say that His Ipseity was in the state of Uniqueness of potential, and in consideration of Uniqueness of Ipseity and Uniqueness of potential God is transcendent from the

plurality of being and the plurality of relationships which are the Uniqueness of plurality. The Shaykh (R.A.) says in the Wisdom of Light: 'The Uniqueness of God by virtue of the Divine Names which require us is the Uniqueness of plurality, and the Uniqueness of God by virtue of His being Rich beyond Need of us and of the Names is the Uniqueness of *'ayn*, and to all of them applies the Name Uniqueness.' Thus, for the Being of the *ḥaqq* there are established in this matter three degrees. One degree is the degree of Absolute Uniqueness, which is the Uniqueness of *'ayn* and the Uniqueness of Ipseity (*dhât*), where the plurality of relationships which is the Uniqueness of plurality, and equally the plurality of being, is not even under consideration in mentation. As the Ipseity is Rich beyond Need of the plurality of being, He is also Rich beyond Need of the plurality of Names. The second degree is this: the degree of Oneness, wherein the plurality of Names is in mentation, but yet where the plurality of the Names are in accordance with Uniqueness because it is only in mentation, and they are not yet differentiated by virtue of the manifestation of their determinations and effects in the places of manifestation, and their differentiations are differentiations of consideration and of relationship. And the third degree is this: the degree of Lordship, where the Names are in the mentation of the second degree and where they are manifested by virtue of the places of manifestation and being, and they are differentiated one from the other. Thus David of Caesarea, may God overlook it for him, and his followers, have erred in the words: '. . . and they were established by it, and are contrary to the Uniqueness of plurality', because he corrected the word '*takhâlifu*' by the word '*yakhâlifu*', and said 'established by the universe and the *ḥaqq* who is contrary to it.' How then by this total is the Uniqueness of plurality? What the Shaykh (R.A.) intends is to express that the necessity of the coming of the plurality over the One Being of the *ḥaqq*, and the necessity of the numerality of the Names, comes from the manifestation of the universe from the *ḥaqq*, and in the sentences above, the Shaykh had relegated the necessity of the plurality for the Being of the *ḥaqq* to the manifestation of the universe from the Being of the *ḥaqq*, because the creation of the universe by the *ḥaqq* is His manifestation in the image of the universe by general revelation. Thus, there is no need to say that for the *ḥaqq* plurality became established by the universe and by the creator of the universe who is the *ḥaqq*. Another aspect of the error is this, that when the plurality of the Divine Names

was necessitated by the manifestation of the universe from the *ḥaqq*, then the Name Creator also becomes realized by the manifestation of the universe. Thus it becomes necessary that before God the High created the universe, that He be qualified with the Quality of Creator-ness before He is qualified with the Quality of Creatorness, and that while He is not called by the Name Creator He is called by the Name Creator. Consequently, it becomes necessary that the Name Creator (*khâliq*) is established by the Name Creator, and this is wrong. Thus, Creatorness is established by the creation of the universe. Another aspect of the error is this also: it becomes necessary that the plurality of Uniqueness is established by the manifestation of the universe and it becomes necessary that the plurality of the Names are also the plurality of the Uniqueness. What is intended here is the expression of the plurality of the Names, not the explanation of the plurality of Uniqueness, because the plurality of Uniqueness, were it to be through the manifestation of the universe, would not be the primary plurality, because it would be impossible to collect and consider the Uniqueness of the Names and the plurality of the Names in one instant in the same place. Another aspect of the error is this: it becomes necessary that the Uniqueness of plurality be established by the Name Creator, yet what emanates from the Quality of Creatorness is plurality, not uniqueness. Yet another aspect of the error is this, that in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* the Names which are in mentation in the Uniqueness would have to be necessarily entered under the Name Creator. Thus, it would be necessary that the Names are creatures. This is also an error. Another aspect of the error is this, that there appears a necessity to enter error into the matter of degrees, and it would necessitate oppression over the degree of plurality of Uniqueness as it would not be placed where it should be, because in the terminology of this group of people, that is this group of people, Uniqueness of plurality is the Uniqueness of the plurality of the Names and Qualities which are in potential in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, and they are in oneness according to the Unity, and plurality in it is an order of relations, and extrinsic in relation to the inexistent receptive potentialities which are in mentation in it, and he represents God as being Unique of 'ayn by virtue of His Uniqueness of Ipseity where the plurality of being and the plurality of relations are not considered in Him, and where all the Names and Qualities and relationships and things which are extrinsic are all in annihilation in Him, and that God is Unique of 'ayn by virtue of His Ipseity and

multiple by virtue of His Names and Qualities. Like the jewel of the *hayûlâ*, unique of 'ayn by virtue of its ipseity, many by the images manifesting from it, which He bears them in Him by His own Ipseity, such as the *haqq* by what manifests from Him of images of revelation. This means that the *hayûlâ* jewel bears in itself in its ipseity all the images which are the plurality of the images that manifest from it; thus the jewel of the *hayûlâ* is both unique of 'ayn by virtue of its ipseity, and many by virtue of what manifests from it. This means that the jewel of the *hayûlâ*, which is in the fourth degree of the degrees of being, is like Nature and has no existence in the sensory existence. Its existence is intellectual and does not exist with essential existence. By its ipseity it bears the totality of the images, and the totality of the images manifest in it. Thus the jewel of the *hayûlâ* is unique of 'ayn by that quality of ipseity wherein there is no plurality with the forms of bodies which are manifested in it, which it bears in its ipseity. They are plural in His potential power by virtue of their manifestation in varied images. In the same way, God also is Unique of 'ayn and plural in the images of revelation which manifest from Him by virtue of His Ipseity, just like the jewel of the *hayûlâ* with those things that manifest from it from the revelations of His Names and Qualities, that is to say, the images of revelations. **And God was the place of reflection of the images of the universe with the Uniqueness of mentation.** That is to say, God became the place of reflection of the images of the universe while Uniqueness was established upon the Uniqueness of mentation, which means that God is plural only by virtue of the manifestation of the *haqq* with the images of His revelation of the Divine Names which were in the potentiality of the Uniqueness of the Uniqueness of Ipseity. It is thus that the *haqq* became the reflector to the images of the universe which are in His potentiality. In other words, when the *haqq* revealed Itself to the inexistent receptive potentialities, the inexistent potentialities became the mirrors of the Being of the *haqq*. In correspondence, the Being of the *haqq* becomes the mirror of the potentialities with the *a'yân*, the potentialities becoming manifest in the Being of the *haqq* through that revelation. Thus the images of the universe become manifest in the Being of the *haqq*, and the Uniqueness of the *haqq* remains in mentation. Consequently the *haqq*, by virtue of the Uniqueness of Ipseity and the intellectuality of the potential, is One, and the many-ness is due to the images of the universe and the images of the Names. **And look how most beautiful is this Divine instruction, to the attainment**

of which God particularized whom He pleases from among His servants. Thus, look at this Divine instruction, how most beautiful it is and what is it that makes it the possessor of value and beauty, such an instruction which God the High relegated specifically to attainment and awareness of that complete person from among His servants, whose Essential Divine *mashî'a* appertains to it. What is meant by the Divine instruction in this is that God instructed us through the language of the Quran and the relating of it by the Envoy of God, that when He ordered the mother of Moses to deposit him in the ark and throw the ark upon the waters, and that the mother of Moses put him in the ark and threw the ark upon the waters, is given to us as instruction in the words of the Quran and related to us by the Envoy of God. What He instructed us with is that that Divine instruction is the real life which is Divine knowledge, and leads to the Light and the Oneness of the Ipseity. Equally, it refers to the Divine instructions which are in the words: 'Or is not that he who was dead, We have made him alive, and We brought to him light by which he walks among people', and the words: 'Do you not see the earth parched, and when We bring down to it the water, it quivered and bore, and it increased and brought forth, and grew comely from each pair?', whereby He mirrors one to the other, the unknowable receptive potentialities, and the established potentialities and the Divine Names which are according to establishment in the One Ipseity. He manifests the images of the Names in the receptive *a'yân*, and the images of the potentialities in the images of the Names, and in the images of the Names He manifests with Names and Qualities and is revealed and pluralized with different revelations, and remains covered and hidden in Oneness in the creation of those revelations with the Essential Oneness of mentation. This Divine instruction is specific of attainment to the most sincere friend of the servants of God and to the most helped individuals and to a few states, whom, in the assembly of the Divine Knowledge, God has reserved for instruction with His Essential *mashî'a*. The Shaykh (R.A.), after having explained the wisdom of the throwing of Moses upon the waters, continued on the wisdom which happens when he comes into the hands of the family of Pharaoh. When the family of Pharaoh found him in the water near the tree, the Pharaoh called Moses *mû*, which is 'water' in the Coptic language, and *sâ* is 'tree'. He named him with what he was found near, because the ark had stopped by the tree in the water. In short, Pharaoh named Moses by a combination of water and tree

where he was found. And he ordered it to be killed, and his wife spoke concerning Moses, and she was speaking thereof by Divine inspired speech. She said to Pharaoh because God had created her for perfection and completion, like the S.A. spoke of it when he corroborated concerning her and Mary, the daughter of 'Imran, by perfection and completion like those of men. Thus, Pharaoh intended to have Moses killed in the usual unsavoury manner. But the Pharaoh's wife, Asiyah, spoke concerning Moses, and Asiyah was speaking with Divine speech in what she said to the Pharaoh, which is to say that God the High had made her speak with Divine speech and the Lordly revelation because God had created her for the perfection of man. In fact, the Envoy (S.A.) had informed of the perfection of Asiyah as when he witnessed in favour of Asiyah and Mary, daughter of 'Imran, with such perfection which is established for the perfection usually for men, because some people are equally qualified by that perfection, which means that the Envoy (S.A.) had brought witness from the Quran where it concerned Asiyah and Mary, daughter of 'Imran. 'God brought an example for those who believe in what Pharaoh's wife said: "Lord, build me a house near You in Your paradise, and save me from Pharaoh and his works, and save me from the oppressive people", and Mary, daughter of 'Imran, who protected her virginity, and We blew into it from Our Spirit, and she was faithful to the words of her Lord and His books, and she was of the pious (righteous).' Here the Shaykh (R.A.), finding that there had interposed a long passage between what she said, repeats it again and says: She said to Pharaoh concerning Moses that: 'He is the joy of my eye and yours', and in this there is the joy of her eye in completion and perfection which happened to her like we said, and it was also the joy of the eye for Pharaoh by belief which God bestowed upon him when he was drowning, and took him clean and cleansed where there was not anything of the mischief, because He took him when he was in belief, before he could receive anything of pollution, and *islâm* (surrendering and fiding in God) necessarily cuts off what has passed before, and brought him as an act for His bounty and grace to whom He wishes so that no one is saddened from the Mercy of God, because nobody is saddened from the Spirit of God except the people who cover up the Truth. Thus Asiyah said: 'In fact Moses is the joy of my eye and also the joy of your eye.' Asiyah's eye really became joyful with Moses, that is to say, became enlightened of that perfection and completion which resulted in Asiyah, and as we mentioned before, that perfection

and completion was most often specific to the greatest of men. Moses also became the joy of his eye for the Pharaoh because of that believing that God bestowed upon the Pharaoh when the Pharaoh was drowning. Thus God the High took Pharaoh clean and cleansed, that is to say, when he was in belief of the Lord of the universes and was cleansed by God from polytheism (*shirk*) by the water of belief, and clean of contention to Lordship in his own self and wrong doctrines. There was not left in him anything of the bodily pollution in the senses or in meanings or in selves or in the spirit, because God the High took him when he was in the act of belief, before he could acquire anything of pollution, and it is such that *islâm* (fiding and surrendering to God) cuts off all which passes prior to it. That is to say, all that of association and crimes and pollutions prior to his *islâm* are cut off, all of which are the Divine rights, like, above all, association and not concordance with the Lord or obedience. Thus the Pharaoh was taken at the level of his belief, before he could acquire anything of pollution, and his last words were the words of belief. God made of Pharaoh's belief, or equally, according to this qualification, made the taking of Pharaoh a Divine act for His bounty, so that the person from among His servants whose *mashî'a* appertained to His bounty, so that not one of those who do misdeeds should be saddened from the Divine Mercy, because no one person other than the people who cover the Truth are saddened away from the Divine Mercy. Had the Pharaoh been one of those to be saddened, he would not have started upon belief. And Moses (S.A.) was like the wife of Pharaoh said in that he was: 'the joy of the eye for me and for you. Do not (you people) kill him. He will be of benefit to us', and it happened like this and God benefited them by the S.A., and they were not aware that he was the prophet on whose hands was the destruction of the possession of Pharaoh and the destruction of his people. Thus, had the Pharaoh been of the class of people who were to be saddened away from the Divine Mercy, he would not have undertaken to believe. Thus Moses (S.A.) became the joy of the eye to Asiyah and to the Pharaoh, and both of them benefited by him. Asiyah, the wife of Pharaoh, had spoken concerning Moses with words of respect as she addressed in the plural case, or that she was addressing the Pharaoh and the people who were instigating the death of the children of Israel. That is why she said: 'He is the joy of the eye for me and for you. Do not you people kill him. It could be that he will benefit us if we adopt him as our child.' That is to say, in fact let Moses be for

both me and for you the joy of the eye. Do not you people kill him. Perhaps soon we will benefit from it. And just like Asiyah said, benefit did come about, because in fact God the High bestowed benefit by Moses (S.A.) to Asiyah and the Pharaoh, and they benefited by him. Yet this was when Asiyah and Pharaoh did not know. That is to say, they had no awareness of the fact that this thing born was that prophet. When the Pharaoh intended to have him killed and Asiyah spoke the above-mentioned words, neither of them knew that the destruction of the realm of Pharaoh and the destruction of the realm of his people was to happen through his hands: That the Pharaoh had no awareness of this is manifest, but for Asiyah, her lack of awareness was not because she was unaware that Moses was the promised prophet, and her endeavour to prevent the killing of Moses was not due to her knowledge of Moses, but that in all her words she was speaking with the Divine speech. She spoke as if she had the intuition and gnosis upon all the orders as they were.

Now the Shaykh (R.A.), in these words and in the words that follow, in all that he says concerning the Pharaoh, makes it very clear that the Pharaoh was a believer before he drowned, and that at the level of his belief he had returned from his mischief and was taken clean and cleansed, and he benefited from an intercession both in the senses and the meaning through belief, because after belief there is no definite and clear proof of his denial or lack of reception of belief after the mention of his belief. Some verses are in accordance with the way of relating some of his misdeeds before belief. However, among the generality of people from among the Muslims, and apart from them, among the Jewish and Christian people, it is established that Pharaoh was a coverer-up of Truth and that he is of the people of fire, because he denied Moses who was the prophet of God and he was an enemy of his (Moses) and the children of Israel, with his words: 'I am your most high god', and also: 'Have I not informed you that there is no god other than me?' He protested Lordship according to what they thought, yet the Quran is the most veridic of witnesses for the belief of Pharaoh before being drowned at the level of drowning, because he clarified with belief when he was in the state of establishing through speech and in the state of his knowledge of being saved by belief. Thus he said: 'I believe in that there is no other God than the one in whom the sons of Israel believe, and I am of the muslims', and these words are veridic information and there is no definitely clear indica-

tion to the refutation of this. The Shaykh (R.A.) says in his *Futûhât* that in the words of God the High: 'This instant, but you had revolted before and you were of the mischief-makers', there is proof of the belief of Pharaoh. In the end of the chapter there is announced that these words explain the reproach to Pharaoh of his rebellion and mischief which happened before, that it does not prove his disbelief. In fact, people have taken this as proof of his belief, and, God willing, this question will be explained in detail at the end of this Wisdom. **And when God protected him from the Pharaoh, the heart of the mother of Moses entered the morning, relieved from grief which had attained it.** When God protected Moses from the Pharaoh and preserved him from being killed by his people which Pharaoh had intended to have done, the heart of the mother of Moses was relieved from sorrow and distress when she entered the morning, which grief had befallen her from the fear of the killing of her son. This was even so that God had inspired her heart, yet conjecture (*wahm*), having predominated, had made her grievous and sad. Thus, in accordance with the Divine *beshara*, corresponding to the morning, when she was informed of Moses' not being killed, her heart was relieved from grief and was left free of it, because she knew that her son was safe and protected.

After that, God forbade him wet-nurses until he received the breast of his mother and he was nursed, so that God completed for her her joy by this. This is so in (accordance with) knowledge of religious laws (*sharâ'i*). That is to say, after the mother of Moses was given the bounty of the bounty of God the High of protecting Moses from the Pharaoh, God forbade to Moses the breast of other wet-nurses. Thus he did not accept the breast of other wet-nurses until he rose to the hands of his own mother. Thus his own mother wet-nursed him so that God the High complete the joy of his mother by wet-nursing him, because motherhood is complete with nursing. The knowledge of the religious legalities is also like this, that is to say, the knowledge of religious legalities is like forbidding the wet-nurses other than the breast of the mother to Moses, because there is a particular private religious law for each prophet. They are forbidden the religious laws of another prophet except that which is legally allowed them from the other religious laws, because it happens sometimes that the knowledge of the religious laws of one prophet is not suitable to the people of another, exactly as the milk of some wet-nurses is not suitable to some children, even though milks are one in the image of being milk, but it

is the nourishment of the body and knowledge is the nourishment of the spirit. It is because of this that each prophet is sent to a specific people with a special knowledge. Thus, the image of forbidding wet-nurses to Moses is the sign that Moses is the promised prophet. As God said: 'We brought to everyone from among you a law (a way), namely a road and a method', ('namely' here is a language of allusion) to mean to say, came from such a road, and this word is an allusion to the origin from which he came, and that is his nourishment. God, addressing all the prophets, said to them: 'We brought to every one of you a way', that is to say, a law, which means: We gave you each a way and a method. Now, in the language of allusion the word used for 'method' is *minhâj*, which means *minhâjâ*, which makes of this word as if it were two words, one of which is *minhâ* and the other *jâ'a*, which would mean: We brought for each of you a law from which road that law came, and the sentence: 'We brought to each one of you a way and a method' becomes an allusion to that origin from which each came. That is to say, an allusion to a Divine Name which is its Lord and which alludes to that Divine origin from the Divine Presence and the realities of necessarily-so-ness, and from whence each person descended to the limit of possibilities. Thus, that origin is its nourishment and he is nourished by that origin. Consequently, each prophet takes the knowledge of its law from one reality which is its 'mother' and its origin. Like the branch of a tree which is not nourished except by its origin, and it is not that what is forbidden in a law is allowed in another law, that is to say, in appearance, by which word I mean, to be allowed in the body of an order is not the same as the one in the past, because the order is always a new creation and there is no repetition. Thus, as the branch of a tree is not nourished except by its origin, that which is forbidden in the law of one prophet is allowed in the law of another, I mean, is in appearance. What I mean by my words 'is allowed' is to say it seems allowed in appearance, because in an order itself that which is allowed in a law is not the same thing as that which was forbidden in a preceding law, because creation is new and there is no repetition in being and revelation. Consequently, that which is forbidden in a law is not the same thing as that which is permitted in another law, but in appearance and supposition they are as if they are the same thing, because order is always a new creation and there is never a repetition in revelation, and it is because of this that it is written with the word 'as if in the image of'. Because of that we have made

you aware. That is to say, because of that we have made you aware by our word 'in image' that that which is forbidden in one law, by virtue of the image it looks as if the same thing was allowed, that is to say, this consideration is by virtue of image, but in the order itself the order is not like that, because the order is a new creation and the images are for things alike. It is by allusion to this that there was the forbidding of wet-nurses concerning Moses. This is because of the reality of who wet-nursed, not because of who gave birth, because the mother who gave birth bore it from the aspect of safekeeping, so that it immanences therein and is nourished by the blood of the fluid of the menstrual flux without its being aware of it. It is like this so that there is not for him in this matter any indebtedness, because he is not nourished except that if he were not nourished by it and it did not get out of her this blood, it would destroy her and would render ill the foetus. Its (the child's) indebtedness to his mother is by its being immanenced (through her). Being nourished by her is helpful to herself from ill effects, which would be to the limit if he did not take this blood from her and did not take it out and did not nourish the foetus. This is to say, as each thing is nourished by its origin God the High forbade wet-nurses concerning Moses as an allusion to this. Thus Moses' mother according to the reality is the woman who wet-nursed him. The woman who bore him is not in reality his mother, because the mother who gives birth (to a child) bears that child by way of being entrusted with it. Thus it becomes immanenced in that mother and is nourished by the blood of the fluid of the menstrual flux without the consciousness of its mother during its being immanenced and during its nourishment through the blood of the menstrual flux, which means that though Moses is immanenced in his mother and is nourished by the blood of the menstrual flux of the mother, the mother has no awareness or will in this matter. This is so, so that for the mother there is no cause for gratitude over it, because in reality he was not nourished except by that blood, which if it were not nourished by it and that blood did not come out of the mother, surely that blood would destroy the mother or render her ill. Thus, for the foetus there is gratitude established for the mother that bore him, as that foetus is nourished by that blood. Thus the foetus, through itself, preserves its mother from such ill as the mother would have witnessed in her body if that blood had remained in her and had not gone out of her and her foetus had not nourished itself with it. The wet-nurse is not like this, because she intends by her wet-nursing to keep

it alive and remaining, which means that the mother who nurses the child is not like the mother who gives birth, because in reality the wet-nurse by nursing the child intends to prolong its life and to keep him alive. And God brought this to Moses in (the person of) the mother of his birth so that there would not be for any other woman a superiority other than the mother of his birth, so that there would be joy in her eyes also in his education, so that she would witness his growth at her own breast and not be saddened. Thus, God the High caused this superiority of indebtedness for Moses where it concerned his mother. That is to say, He allocated to the mother of his birth his wet-nursing so there was no superiority of indebtedness for any other woman except the mother of his birth, because Moses did not accept the breast of any other wet-nurse. Nobody became his wet-nurse, so that the mother of Moses was able again to have the joy of her eye through the education of Moses and to observe his growth at her own chest, and that she was not saddened by witnessing him at the breast of another wet-nurse and become saddened with separation. It means that God the High made his birth-mother his wet-nurse due to His granting of superiority to Moses, so that there would be no superiority of any other woman except his own mother over him; in the same way, due to His granting superiority to Moses' mother of birth so that the mother of his birth has joy of her eyes. What is alluded to in the forbidding of the wet-nurses other than the mother of Moses is this: the reality of Moses is that any other knowledge of a way (religious law) was forbidden to him except the knowledge of the law which came to him through the breast of his mother, because Moses was a prophet. Thus, if ever any other reality than what his prophethood necessitated in the realities of Unity (*tawhîd*) and abstraction and annihilation and of *fanâ'*, and was educated by realities which his sainthood required, then he would not have appeared as a prophet. That is why he was not in complete converse in conversation with Elijah, and separated from him, because Moses was manifested with prophethood, and a prophet during his prophethood is according to certain knowledges which the saint is not, and the saint, in his state of closeness and annihilation, is over some knowledges which the prophet is not so that his prophethood is not prevented, like the knowledges of *qadâ'* and *qadar* and the knowledges of the established potentialities. And God saved him from the sadness of the ark, and burnt his darknesses of nature by what God gave him of Divine knowledge, if he does not go out of it. God the High

saved Moses from the sadness of the ark, and the ark is his human nature (*nâsût*). Thus Moses burnt the darkness of nature by what God bestowed on him of Divine knowledge, if he does not go out of nature and its determinations by that Divine knowledge, because in whichever generality He manifests, of course He manifests in the places of manifestation of nature. It is never outside of nature. At the very utmost He manifests in the image which is purest and the most light image of nature in the universe of sanctity. And He tempted him with many temptations, that is, He tried him in many areas so that it would be realized in his self his patience with what God has afflicted him, and the first thing God afflicted him with is his killing of the Egyptian, with which God had inspired him, and He helped him in the mystery of it and he was not in the knowledge of this, but there was not any concern in himself due to this killing (that is to say 'heed', to say he was not worried by what he was afflicted with). In his being he did not wait until the order from his Lord gave him in this, because the prophet is interiorly innocent when he does not know, until he is notified of it, that is to say, that he has been tested by this. And God the High tested Moses in many areas so that his patience would be realized in himself to all with which God the High had inflicted him, so that he be sure of foot in patience, because many of the Divine perfections and completions in the human emergence manifest with afflictions and tests; so the first affliction with which God the High afflicted Moses was his killing of the Egyptian by means of His help to Moses and making him able through God's inspiration and its mystery in the act of killing the Egyptian. That is to say, Moses killed the Egyptian in accordance with the inspiration and God's lending him the ability to kill the Egyptian (in accordance) within the mystery (of this action). It is true that Moses did not know that he killed by the order of God the High, because he was not yet sent as a prophet. However, by this killing, Moses did not find in his own self any heed, even though Moses did not depend on the coming of a Divine order to kill. Because he is not made aware by Divine inspiration, the interior of the prophet is always innocent until he is informed of it by God. This means, the interior of the prophet is always innocent of committing major sins. Thus Moses killed the Egyptian with the Divine inspiration to his heart to kill, without his being aware of it, because as he was not informed he had no knowledge that he killed him by Divine inspiration to kill, because had he known, it would not have been affliction and he would not have

run away from the Pharaoh, but because he did not know, he ran away from the Pharaoh and was afflicted by committing himself to strange lands, and he took refuge with Jethro (S.A.), and through his education he became apt to the manifestation of the prophethood which was in his potential. And it is because of this, that is to say, that Moses did not know that he killed the Egyptian by the order of his Lord, that Elijah showed him the killing of the child, and he repudiated the killing of the child and he did not remember his killing the Egyptian, and Elijah said to him: 'I did not do it of my own order.' By this, he (Elijah) awakened him by the words to his degree, and that is that he had also killed by the Divine order and that the prophet is always innocent of action in the order itself, and that he is not made aware by this. This means that because Moses did not know that he had killed the Egyptian by Divine order, Khidr-Elijah (S.A.) showed him the killing of the child. Thus Moses repudiated the killing of the child by Khidr-Elijah, and Moses did not remember that he had killed the Egyptian. Had Moses known that in the murder he committed he had committed it by Divine order, he would not have repudiated the action of Khidr-Elijah. He would have known by taste that killing happens by Divine order. Thus Khidr-Elijah (S.A.) said to Moses (S.A.): 'I did not do it by my own order.' In this, Khidr-Elijah awakens Moses to his degree where he also killed by Divine order, before Moses was informed of it, when the self is innocent of action. That is to say, in movement and in action it is innocent, that whatever emanates from it emanates by Divine order. As Moses was unaware, he related the killing to the Satan and said: 'This is the work of the Satan', and he asked for forgiveness of his Lord and said: 'Lord, I have put my self into oppression and darkness. Overlook my sin.' Thus, when Khidr killed the child by the order of God and told of this to Moses, he awakened Moses to the fact that he also killed the Egyptian by the order of God, and that killing was neither from his own self nor from the Satan, and that he was innocent of all action without the Divine order. The determination of the affliction which was caused by the killing of the Egyptian was completed. That is why Khidr-Elijah made him aware, so that the repentance and the sadness caused by the killing of the Egyptian should be removed from him. He also showed him the piercing of the boat, which is destruction in appearance, and salvation from the usurper in its interior, and he brought this to him in juxtaposition of his ark which was upon the waters covering him totally, and its exterior was destruction, and inwardly salvation.

And Khidr (S.A.) showed to Moses (S.A.) the piercing of the boat, the exterior of which is destruction, that is to say, image of destruction, and the interior is salvation from the usurper. Khidr did the piercing of the boat for himself, that is to say, he himself manifested with the piercing of the boat, just as the ark was for Moses upon the water covering him totally. Thus, the exterior of this ark for Moses is the image of destruction, but its interior is salvation. **And when his mother had done this it was because of the fear of the hand of the usurper Pharaoh, so that he would be dead in captivity (so that he would die covered up, that is, enclosed) and she would see it happen.** This means that it was because she was afraid that Pharaoh would tie the hands and feet of Moses and would kill him in front of the eyes of the mother that the mother of Moses put him into the ark and put the ark upon the waters. He says to kill in captivity, and the captivity of Man or other things for killing is to enclose, to shut up, to imprison and to throw until it dies. The best way is to read this as that he would be dead, enclosed. **By inspiration (that is to say, she did it by inspiration) this is what God inspired her with when she did not know, and Moses witnessed in himself that she was nursing him (feeding him), and when she was afraid for him put him in the waters, and as known in the saying: 'When the eye does not see, the heart is not afflicted', she was not frightened over him with the fear of witnessing him with the eyes and was not saddened over him with the sadness of the vision of the eye, and her imagination dominated, her pretty imagination that one day God might return him to her, and she lived with this imagination in herself, and prayer is against fear and sadness. She said when she was inspired that may it be so that this is that envoy who has the destruction of Pharaoh and the Egyptians upon his hands, and she lived and was happy with this conjecture, and supposition with a view to her is knowledge of the order itself. Due to the Divine inspiration of which she had no knowledge, whereas Moses in his own self observed this as though she was breast-feeding Moses, and when the mother of Moses feared over Moses and thus put him upon the waters, because as the saying goes: 'When the eyes do not see, the heart is not afflicted', so she was spared the fear of seeing with the eyes and she was not saddened with the sadness of vision, and because of her beauty of thinking that God may give Moses back to her some day, the mother of Moses lived and remained in herself with this imagination, and prayer is against fear and sadness. Thus the mother of Moses, when she was inspired with this action, said it would be prayed**

that this child is that very child by whose hand Pharaoh and the Egyptians shall be destroyed, and with this conjecture the mother of Moses lived in joy, and this conjecture and this imagination is in the order itself knowledge, as it is a reality with God, though it was a supposition with consideration of the mother of Moses because she was not at the state of *yaqîn* that her son was that promised envoy and that Pharaoh and his people will be destroyed by him. Afterwards, he (that is, Moses), when the desire came upon him, he went out, running away (from Egypt) apparently in fear, whereas in the real meaning it was through love of salvation. When Moses killed the Egyptian, later on he had the desire to run away from Egypt. This running away looked as if it were out of fear, but in reality it was due to running away through love of salvation, which means that according to appearances one would understand that he ran away out of fear, but in reality it was not like that. Rather that Moses was innocent of killing the Egyptian and that he did this due to God's Divine order when he had no awareness of doing it. In the same way, his running away was due to Divine order due to his love of eternal life and eternal salvation, and all this while he was not aware of it. That salvation is this, that the order of prophethood which is in his essence in potential should be manifested in action, and the Divine image which is the eternal Divine life should be revealed in him, and that he himself should reach the limit of perfection and completion that he find salvation from the darkneses of natural character and from the aggressive force and impetuosity of human qualities. Thus, what God intended by inspiring Moses' heart with the order of running away, was to make him reach the degree of prophethood. And in fact movement is always nothing other but that it is love, and the observer is veiled from it (in this matter) are other motives and that it is not this (which is the real motive). Because movement is always love, that is to say, no one moves towards a direction or starts an action except that the love of movement is placed in his heart from God, and the person who is observing the movement becomes veiled with other reasons and thinks there is nothing which causes the movement other than the visible motives. However, in reality those manifest reasons are not the reasons for the movement. Thus, the reason which caused the movement in Moses was not in reality the fear of having killed. It was rather perhaps that his movement was the movement of love. It is the movement of the Divine Love which is in the words: 'I was a hidden treasure and I loved to be known', which is the

manifesting and total manifestation which is what causes eternal life. The movement of Moses at that moment was in reality the movement of Divine Love which is mentioned in the *ḥadīth qudsi*. The Divine Love which is aspected from God to His creation necessitates the manifestation of God with total manifesting and manifestation and polishing and reflection which is in the degree of the Perfect and Complete Man. Thus, the Perfect and Complete Man is under the determination of that movement of Divine Love before his completion. Thus the movement of Divine Love necessitated in Moses that in the place of manifestation of Moses there should result total witnessing and causing to witness and total revelation and collective and complete gnosis, and in this way Moses moved so that the Divine image, which is the Divine Trust which was placed in Moses, was preserved and made to preserve, and by virtue of the spirits which are the places of Mosaic manifestation which are comprised in his spirit, that they reach the perfection for which they were deemed worthy. And in this way it is that the origin of the movement of the universe from the non-existence (*‘adam*), wherein it was in quietude, to being, is thus said to be that it is the order of movement from quietude was the movement which is the existence of the universe is the movement of love, and the Envoy (S.A.) brought it to awareness that this is so, by his words: ‘I was a treasure unknown, and loved to be known.’ Had there not been this love, the universe would not have manifested as it is, and the movement from non-being to being is the movement of love of the one who brings into being for the movement of love of the one that is brought into being. In fact, the origin of the manifestation and coming into being of the universe from non-being, wherein the universe was in quietude, is movement to being. That is why it is said that the order of being is movement from quietude, that is to say, the movement into being of the universe which was in quietude in non-being, because quietude precedes movement. It is thus that the movement which is the coming into being of the universe became the movement of love. That is to say, it became the movement which emanated from the Essential Divine Love. This is what the Envoy (S.A.) meant to make aware in reality. In other words, the movement of the universe from non-being into being is the movement of love. That is what he pointed at in his words: ‘I was a hidden treasure and unknown, and I loved to be known.’ Thus, had there not been this Essential Divine Love, the universe would not have manifested in the same love relationship, and would have remained in its

original quietude in non-being. Thus the movement of the universe to being is the movement of the love of One Being who brought into being the universe. Consequently, by bringing into being the universe for the purpose of the gnosis of God, the aspecting of movement of Divine Love so that God be known and that He witness His own Ipseity in His own Ipseity, and also in the same way, that He witness it also from others, when and if the being of other is taken into consideration. And it is also so that the universe equally loves witnessing itself in its being, like it did its emanating, which was in every way its movement from non-emanating non-being to becoming, which is the movement of love from the side of God and from its own side, and it is so that perfection and completion is loved by its own self, and the knowledge of the High of Himself, from the point of view that He is Rich beyond Need of the universes, is for Him. What remains for Him is the completion of the degree of knowledge by the knowledge of the recent which results from these potentialities, the potentialities of the universe, and if He brought into being and manifested the image of perfection and completion with the knowledge of the recent and the ancient, it is that He perfected and completed the degree of knowledge from both aspects. Equally, movement is always of love for the universe, because in reality the universe, like the *haqq*, loves witnessing its own self in being, just as it witnessed its own self established in non-being. Thus, in every way the movement of the universe from the established non-being to being became movement of love from the side of God and from its own side, because perfection and completion is in itself beloved, whether this be considered as God's perfection and total manifestation or Man's becoming perfect and complete. Perfection and completion does not manifest except by the being of the potential. The knowledge of God the High of Its own Self and of Its Ipseity is, by virtue of the fact that He is Rich beyond Need of the universes, special to Him. The creature has no access to this. Thus it is that God the High knows His Ipseity by Its own Ipseity. Thus, there is not a single degree of knowledge left for God's knowledge except the knowledge of the recent with which to complete the degrees of knowledge. That is to say, there only remained the completion of the degrees of knowledge by the knowledge of the latter, such a latter knowledge which results from these potentialities which are the potentialities of the universe. When these potentialities of the universe come into being with their potential being, then the image of perfection and completion manifests with the

knowledge of the latter and the knowledge of the previous. Thus the degrees of knowledge become complete according to both aspects, through the aspect of the Ipseity and through the aspect of the manifestation of the potentialities in the universe.

It is possible to consider in this sentence the words: 'and His knowledge of Himself by His own Self' to be an answer to a possible question. If it were that the questioner asked: 'As God knows His Ipseity and His perfections and completenesses before coming into being of the universe and before His manifestation in the images of the universe, then what is the use of bringing into being the universe?', the Shaykh (R.A.) answers this by what follows, that the knowledge of the High God of Its own Ipseity is from all eternity and for all eternity established for Him due to His being Rich beyond Need of the universes, yet His manifesting in the receptive potentialities which are in annihilation in His own Ipseity, and His witnessing in those potentialities and the revelation in those potentialities of the Qualities and Names, depend on the coming into being of those potentialities. The knowledge of God of everything is by virtue of that thing. God's knowledge of a thing in the Divine Knowledge while that thing is established in non-being is in accordance with the image of the non-being of that thing. By its manifestation in the being of the potential it becomes God's knowledge by the image of its potentiality, which image of potentiality is not the same as the image in non-being except by mentation. Thus, as knowledge is subject to that which is known, and as that which is known is in renovation at every instant, so also is knowledge at every instant according to latterness. Thus, the degrees of knowledge become perfected and completed by manifestation. **And such is the completion of the degrees of being. It is that their being is of all eternity, and other than all eternity as it is latter, and those of all eternity are the Being of the *ḥaqq* in His own Self. And such are the degrees of being which also become complete by the potentialities of the universe, because some of the beings are of all eternity and some of them not of all eternity, and the ones that are not of all eternity are latter, and the beings from all eternity is the Being of the *ḥaqq* by Its own Being, which are the beings of the potentiality of the Ipseity. And those which are not of all eternity is the Being of the *ḥaqq* by the images of the established universe. That is, the beings which are not of all eternity is the Being of the *ḥaqq* which manifests with the images of the universe, which universe is established in potential in the Knowledge from all**

eternity. These are called latter because they manifest some to some others, and God manifests Himself by the images of the universe and completes being. Thus it was that the movement of the universe is of love for completion. So understand. Thus, the Being of the *haqq* which manifests with the images of the universe are called latter, which means that they are called latter because it is such that in reality some of the universe manifests itself to some other. Thus God becomes manifest to Himself by the images of the universe because God is the same as the universe with His images. Thus, the being of the universe becomes complete because knowledge of prophethood is not the same as being. Thus, the movement of the universe from non-being to being becomes the movement of love for the coming about of the completion of being, which means that it is the movement which emanates from the Essential love for the manifesting and witnessing of the completion and perfection of God. So understand. Do you not see how He breathed out or enlarged from the Divine Names which had not been brought into existence due to the non-existence of the manifestation of their effects in the essence of what is called the universe? And there was for Him the ease of the beloved, but this was not reached except by the being of the images unto the very high and unto the lowest, and it became established that the movement was for love, and after that there is not a movement in the immanence other than that it is of love. Do you not see the High God, how He expanded the Breath from the Divine Names in the essence of that which is called the universe, that torment that the Names witnessed due to the non-being of the place of manifestation of the effects of the Names? That is to say, because of the lack of the manifestation of the effects which were in potential in the Divine Names, the Names were in constriction. Thus, by manifesting their effects in what is called the universe, God the High expanded the Breath of their constriction. Another way of understanding this is: do you not see how God the High expanded the Breath from the Divine Names, the torment that the Names used to witness in the essence of what is called the universe due to the non-manifestation of the effects of the Names? Which means that before the creation of what is known as the universe, as there was no place or place of manifestation for the manifestation of the effects of those Names, the Names were in constriction due to the non-manifestation of the effects of the Names. Thus God the High removed with the expansion of the Breath the constriction and torment by means of the universe. Thus, for God the

High, ease became beloved from the aspect of the Names. Yet the ease was not reached until the bringing about of the being of the images which are unto the highest and to the lowest, whereby it was eased out of torment as the Names manifested their effects in the being of images. Thus, it became established that in fact movement happened for love. Consequently, there is not a movement in being which is manifest in the immanence except that it is the movement of love because it emanates from the Love of the Divine Ipseity, which emanate from the Essential Divine Names, which is for their expansion with the manifestation of their determination and effects, which is potentially in the Divine Names, and also to appertain to their breath of expansion for the purpose of manifestation of the perfection and completion of the Names, and also for the witnessing and manifestation of the perfection and completion of the *ḥaqq*. There are of the knowers who know this, and of them there are who are veiled by the closest cause in their-determination in the state and because of its invasion of the self; and fear was observed to exist for Moses when the killing of the Egyptian happened, but the fear was love of escape, salvation, from the killing, and he ran when he was afraid. The meaning of this is that he ran when he loved the salvation from the Pharaoh and his works, and that is why he mentioned it with this cause as the closest that was observed of him at that time. It is like the image to the body of the human being, and the love of salvation comprises in it the comprising of the body in the spirit which is the manager for it. Thus, some of the knowers know that this movement is of love, and this knower appertains to the knowledge of Lordship; thus he knows that the fleeing of Moses was due to the love of salvation. Some of the knowers is such a knower that the closest cause has veiled him, because the closest cause in a state determines over the veiled self and because it invades over the self. Thus, in the case of Moses, at the killing of the Egyptian, that which happened with the witnessed fear, that is to say, Moses, by killing the Egyptian, witnessed in his own self a fear, and that fear comprised his love of salvation from the fear of having killed. Thus, visibly, Moses ran away when he loved salvation from the killing, that is to say, from the Pharaoh and his works, that is to say, due to the love of salvation. Thus Moses (S.A.), during his conversation with the Pharaoh, mentioned this closest cause when he said: 'And I ran away from you when I was frightened of you.' That cause was witnessed where Moses was concerned. This can also be understood in the following way:

Moses mentioned the closest cause, which cause was observed by him at the time he ran away from the Pharaoh, such a cause which is like the image of the body for the human being, and the love of salvation is comprised in that running away, just as the body comprises the spirit which is in charge of the body. Thus, fear is the closest cause, and love of salvation is the distant cause. In consideration of reality, however, movement depends on love of salvation, which means, even though the movement and running away of Moses (S.A.) is reasonably assigned to the cause of fear, according to the understanding of 'and ran away from you when frightened of you', yet reality necessitates that the movement is not due to fear, because fear necessitates quietude and does not necessitate movement. It is rather that the cause which causes movement in a person who stands in horror of something displeasing is the love of salvation from that, and love of life. Thus, when Moses (S.A.) saw something which necessitated the strength of salvation which is what he loved, he feared, and due to what salvation required he ran away. Thus, in reality, what caused the movement and the running away was not fear but the love of salvation. However, Moses (S.A.) mentioned the closest cause which is like the image of the body of the human being in relationship to the spirit which is in charge of the body. That is to say, fear, which is the closest cause, in relationship to the love of salvation, which is the distant cause, is like the relationship of the image of the human body to the spirit which is in charge of the body. The Shaykh (R.A.) likened the fear which comprised the love to the thing which comprises the spirit for when the effect took place, and 'it is like the image of the body to the human being' thus become an adjective for the closest cause. Later on the Shaykh (R.A.) pointed out the reason why Moses (S.A.) mentioned the closest cause and hid the distant cause, although Moses knew that the distant cause was that which caused the effect, and said: **For the prophets, for them is the tongue of the manifest by which they speak to people in general**, which means that for the prophets (S.A.) there is the tongue of the manifest with which they talk, because the address is for the understanding of the general (public). The Divine address is in accordance with the manifest understanding which is the understanding of the general (public). The prophets (S.A.) speak with that tongue. Had the Divine address descended for the comprehension of the elite and they (the prophets) spoke with that tongue, those people who are conditioned with the manifest understanding, which is the lowest of understanding,

would have been left outside. Thus the prophets speak according to the manifest tongue, and the people, due to the dissimilarity of their aptitude to understand, take it dissimilarly, **and they (the prophets) count on the understanding of the knowing hearer.** That is to say, the prophets speak according to the manifest tongue and they count on the understanding of the knowledgeable elite who listen to them, because the knowledgeable listener, due to his private understanding, infers the extra meaning from that manifest speech, which the generality (of the public), who are conditioned by the manifest understanding, cannot understand. **The envoys do not consider except the general, because they know the degree of the people of understanding.** Thus the envoys (S.A.) do not consider any other language in address except the language of the general (public), and do not speak with any other language, because they know the degree of the people of understanding, that the people of understanding, due to their private aptitude and comprehension, will understand the meaning which is effectively intended from their speech. Consequently, their language is the language of the manifest. **As the S.A. made aware of this degree in the matter of gifts, and said: 'I give to a man whereas another is more beloved to me than him. out of fear that God enters this man (the one I have given to, or the one who is less beloved to me) into fire.'** In fact, the Envoy (S.A.) made aware of this degree when he spoke of the gifts from the public treasury. Thus he said: In fact I give to a man whereas another man is more beloved of me than him, due to the fear that he would imprecate God. That is to say, I am more bountiful to a man who is of low generality as I prefer him as the object of my bounty rather than that honourable person who is in fact more beloved of me than him, because if I bestow upon a person who is closer to me and more beloved, that ordinary man would say he gave to his close and deprived the one who is further away from him. Thus he becomes a denier of the truth by virtue of the fact that he has no awareness, or becomes a renegade. Consequently God the High may enter him into the fire, and by not bestowing on the one who knows, such words will not emanate from him. **He considered the weak of intellect and vision who is dominated by greed and low nature.** Thus, in this matter of gifts, the Envoy (S.A.) considered the person who was weak of intelligence and vision, upon whom greed and low nature is predominant, and he preferred him. The word for nature, *ṭab'a*, is here with the silence of the letter 'b'. This is the best way, because what the *ḥadīth* means by

that man is a Muslim man who is yet not freed from the worldly greed and the human animal nature, and also whose intellectual belief is weak. The word *ṭaba'a*, with the open diacritical sign, means 'religion', which in the words '*ṭaba'a* the God to their heart' is the Divine *ṭaba'a* which is special to the coverers-up of Truth, because those hearts which are by God imprinted and sealed have no aptitude for belief. With the same diacritical sign it is also possible to understand this word to mean 'pride' and 'sadness'. **Thus, what they brought of knowledge, they brought it and cloaked it in the lowest understanding, so that those who have no deep delving for it stop at the level of the cloak.** That is to say, the envoys, as they speak with the manifest language, the knowledge which they brought from the knowledge with God, they brought what they brought yet they put over it the clothes of the lowest understanding. That is to say, the knowledge which they take from God they manifest in the clothing of the lowest understanding which is the manifest knowledge, and they interpret the knowledges and their meanings with words which are closest to their understanding, so that a person who has no deep delving for wisdom and meaning remains at the level of the clothing, and the clothing or the cloak is the manifest speech. **And they say: 'What an excellent cloak is this', and see it as the end of degrees.** Thus the people who stop at the level of the apparent cloak, who are the people of the lowest understanding, say: 'What a wonderful cloak is this', and they see it as the last of the degrees and do not see anything better than it. **And the person of fine understanding, who dives deep for the pearls of wisdom, says: 'By what did this man deserve this cloak from the king?'** The one who dives deep for the pearls of wisdom is a person of deep understanding who knows by what reason he deserved this cloak with which he was cloaked from the king. **And he looks at the value of the cloak and its class from among garments and knows from it the value of the person who was made to wear that cloak.** Thus, looking at the value and the class of the cloak from among the clothing, he knows from the value of that cloak the value of that person who was made to wear that cloak, because each prophet's and each saint's cloak of knowledge which was bestowed upon him is by virtue of the value of his aptitude. Thus the gnostic, who is the deep diver for pearls of wisdom and meaning, understands the value of the owner of those words and his degree in knowledge from his words. **And he attains to knowledge which has not resulted for another for whom there is no such knowledge equal to this.** Thus

the person of fine understanding attains to a knowledge where such knowledge is not for any other, that other for whom no knowledge results like the knowledge of this diver for pearls of wisdom. Thus, the diver of the seas of knowledge and meaning, who is the gnostic, understands the value of the person who addresses him from his words. Consequently, the words of the prophets and envoys are according to the apparent meaning because of this. **When the prophets and envoys and heirs know that in the universe and among their people there is he who is in this position, they deliberately continue in expression of the manifest tongue in which there results the association of the elite and the public, and the elite understand what the public understands from it and more, due to which it became veridic for them the name which is 'elite', and they are differentiated from the public by that.** When the prophets and the envoys and the heirs know that indeed in the universe and among their people there exists such a person who is in this situation, that is to say, he attains to a knowledge which does not result for others, they (that is, the prophets, envoys and heirs) inclined in expression and intended the expression for the manifest public, in which language there results the association of the elite and the public. That is to say, they did not express the words according to the language of the elite but they considered the public language which is the manifest, in which both the elite and the public are in association. Thus the elite understand from that language what the public understands of knowledge, and understand even more than what the public understands, and that what is more is a thing due to which the name became veridic for the elite, and that name in reality is 'elite'. That is to say, for that which they understood more, the name 'elite' became true for the elite. Thus the elite became differentiated from the general by that, and they are called with the name 'the elite'. **Those who communicate knowledge were contented with that** (that is, with the manifest language). Thus, the prophets, the envoys and the heirs who communicate knowledge, contented themselves with the manifest language, and pronouncing their words according to the manifest language they placed in accordance with the manifest language the religious laws and the basis of religion. Had the prophets, envoys and heirs, who dive into the ocean of meaning, brought to the shores of the sea some of the jewels of Divine Reality and pearls of fine meaning which are within those words, the people of appearances, who do not understand anything further than the shores of the sea and

the language of the apparent, would have denied them, and they would have confined the endless sea of Divine knowledge to their own understanding. 'Say: Had the sea been to the same extent of my Lord's words, the sea would have finished before the words of my Lord had finished, even if we had brought as much sea again.' And this is the wisdom of the words: **'ran away from you when I was frightened of you'** (of Moses S.A.), and he did not say: **'ran away from you because of love of peace and well-being.'** Thus Moses (S.A.), when he said those words, he expressed his words according to the manifest language. This is the wisdom of those words. He did not say: 'I ran away from you because of the love of peace and well-being', and did not mention the words according to the understanding of the elite. He spoke them according to the understanding of the public who look for the closest cause and do not look at reality.

After this, the Shaykh (R.A.) begins with the wisdom in the coming of Moses (S.A.) to Midian: **And he came to Midian and saw two young girls and he watered for them (their animals) without remuneration, and then he took refuge in the Divine shade.** Thus Moses (S.A.), after having run away from Egypt, came to Midian which was the country of Jethro (Shu'ayb), and found the two famous young girls, who were the daughters of Jethro (S.A.), near a well, who wished to water their animals. Thus Moses (S.A.), without any remuneration, watered the animals for those two girls and after which he took refuge under a tree which was the Divine shade. That is to say, in his view the shade of the tree was the Divine shade, or he turned to and took refuge in the Divine place of manifestation of his self which is the Divine refuge, or else, he desired the Divine shade and turned to it and he is the Perfect and Complete Man who is the place of manifestation of Divinity. That is why he entered into the shade of Jethro who is the Divine shade. In the human emergence, Moses' running away from the people of Pharaoh is the vision of the expansion of the spirit from the passion of its potentialities which in itself is the images of the views of the people of Pharaoh. The fact of Moses turning towards Midian is the image of his turning to the social form which is the collectivity between the natural bodily powers and the specialty of Divine spiritual powers according to the necessities of the powers of intellect of the spirit and transporting of dogmas of belief, where that form is the aptitude to the reality of the heart for which Jethro is its place of manifestation. This is so because after the human spirit has differentiated

from the powers of nature, and that having distinguished between good and bad, and praiseworthy and blameworthy, there happens to be a part in him which demands salvation from the preponderance of the powers of desires and animality over the powers of the intellect and belief. Thus, having expanded from the growth of the powers of the apparent form, it turns to the powers of interior spiritual heart. The water of Midian is the image of religiously legal knowledge which is general in the life on earth, in which are associated both the elite of the powers of the heart and form and the generality of people. The Divine shadow is the Divine Being which is the abode of the spirit of the human intellect, and that tree from which the shadow extends is the uniqueness of the totality of the collectivity of the perfection and completion of the human being which is the collectivity of selfhood and of desires and of angers both in the spirituality and in the body. Thus, that human collectivity is the uniqueness of the collectivity of the plurality of mutually interlacing (*mutashâjira*) humanity which is mutually coupled and varied. The two girls are the images of the strength of belief and the strength of thought. These are of the results of the powers of the heart which collect together between natural powers and the specialities of the powers of the spirit. Here Moses said: 'Lord, I am indeed needy of what of goodness You have descended upon me', meaning, the watering of the animals of the two girls is a good thing that You brought down upon me, thus I am in need of the good thing that You bring down upon me. And he brought the knowledge of watering to be the same as goodness which the God had brought down to him, and qualified his *nafs* with need of God in goodness which is with Him. Thus Moses (S.A.) made his knowledge of watering to be the same as goodness which God had brought down to him, and equally, he qualified his *nafs* as being in need of God in such goodness as is existent at His level and from whom that goodness emanates. Thus, the goodness which is existent at His level, which is the action of watering, is what he qualified his own self with as in need of God, and this points at the fact that he required the watering of his spirit with the place of manifestation of the complete teacher from the well of Divine knowledge which is the life of the spirits under the Divine shadow, and he explained to God his necessity and his need of God concerning that watering. It is as if observing his own spirit and *nafs* was in the same way thirsty as the spiritual powers and the powers of the animal *nafs* of the two girls for the Divine knowledge, whereupon he requested the

spiritual and Divine realities from the place of manifestation of Divine knowledge and Lordly effusion which is the life of the spirits. Or else, when Moses (S.A.) understood in accordance from reality from his own self that in fact at the level of the High God there exists for himself prophethood and envoyship which is being brought down to him, and that the goodness of the action of watering is some of that goodness, he explained to God what he needed concerning that goodness which was established definitely at the level of the High God, that that goodness be both of this world and of the other world, and that it be both of the self and of the spirit, and both of knowledge and gnosis.

When Khidr-Elijah likened the sinking of the ship in juxtaposition to Moses' ark, and the killing of the children equally in juxtaposition to Moses' killing of the Egyptian, and the rebuilding of the wall without pay being in juxtaposition to Moses' watering without remuneration, the Shaykh (R.A.), having explained the two orders, now goes on to explain the third order. Khidr showed him the rebuilding of the wall without taking any remuneration, and he (Moses) blamed him for this, and (Khidr) reminded him that he had watered without remuneration, until (he would have mentioned) other things like this, which are not mentioned, so that the S.A. wished that Moses had been silent and had not objected, so that God would have related of them as these orders (in the Quran). Thus Khidr showed Moses the rebuilding of the wall without remuneration in juxtaposition with Moses' watering the animals of the daughters of Shu'ayb without remuneration. Moses objected to Khidr not asking a remuneration for the rebuilding of the wall, and said: 'Why is it that you did not ask for a remuneration?' Thus Khidr, in showing Moses the rebuilding of the wall without remuneration, mentioned to Moses that he, Moses, was clothed with watering the animals without remuneration. This can also be read as follows: Khidr reminded Moses through rebuilding without remuneration that Moses himself was dressed in watering the animals without remuneration, that is, as if Moses had watered the animals of the two girls was the causes of forgetfulness which was attached to Moses, and thus Khidr, by the act of rebuilding the wall, had reminded him of it. Or it can also be read as follows: that Khidr reminded Moses of his act of rebuilding the wall without remuneration in response to Moses' watering the animals without remuneration.

Other than this, Khidr attempted to show some other determinations, but he did not mention them because Moses (S.A.) was not

patient. This sentence can also be read as to mean: Khidr attempted to show certain other determinations than this, which we have not mentioned in this book, for which the Envoy (S.A.) had wished that Moses had been silent; would that Moses had not objected to Khidr so that God would have brought down the order concerning Moses and Khidr according to that, and related it in the Quran. It is narrated that the Prophet (S.A.) said: 'Would that brother Moses had patience so that God would relate to us from his prophethood', and it is also narrated that: 'God's *rahmah* would be on us and to Moses had he been patient so that it was narrated to us of his prophethood', and it is also mentioned, equally veridic: 'Had he been patient in seeing the strange things', and it is related from the Shaykh (R.A.) that Khidr (S.A.) joined Abu Abbas, and Khidr said to him: 'I would have enumerated to Moses, son of 'Imran, a thousand queries which took place from before he was born up to the time of his meeting, but he was not patient even with three of these.' Thus Khidr (S.A.) pointed out to Moses (S.A.) that all the states that have happened to Moses and all that will happen to him is according to the order and Will of God the High, and they happen through His Knowledge, because it is impossible that it should be other than through God's Knowledge. The knowledge of those states is of the specialty of sainthood from which the envoy is veiled during his invitation, because it is of the knowledge of the mystery of *qadar*, and if the envoy had attained to that knowledge it would be possible that he would be worried in the exposition of the order, with which exposition he is ordered, because if a person is given a knowledge in witnessing that it is a thing that happens through the Divine order which affects all the servants, and to which there is no way of opposing, it would be not possible for him to prevent a person from such a thing or to order a person in disaccordance with it, or that that witnessing should cause the denial of an order. However, the envoy is ordered by exposition from God the High while he is in that knowledge, which although it happens from some who are ordered and does not happen from others, yet what God the High intends from His order to be exposed from an envoy is exposition only: 'For the envoy is only the exposition.' Thus, a person who has attained the mystery of *qadar* sometimes finds himself in the vision of the non-happening of a determination with the exposition of which he is appointed, and does not remember that he is only appointed with exposition, whether that thing will come about according to the order or not. Thus, keeping in

vision the fact that that order will not happen, it might sometimes happen that the person would refrain from exposing the order with the exposition of which he is ordered. It might also be that he would be worried in his invitation, observing that that thing will not come about, the thing with which he is ordered to expose, and the joining of these two orders would be very difficult for him. Thus God the High, because of His mercy upon them, has obliterated this knowledge which would be difficulties in these mysteries for the prophets, and this does not bring about any shortcoming in the degrees of the prophets and in the perfections which are special to them. The most honourable of the *anbiyâ'* and the most complete, the Envoy (S.A.), observed in this knowledge that which no one else has witnessed, and he pointed at this mystery and said: 'The verset of Hud has rendered me white-haired', because the verset on Hud contains the phrase: 'And directed as I ordered', because the Envoy (S.A.) is ordered with direction in invitation, which invitation is refused at the level of those who cover up the Truth, and is not refused at the level of those who believe. Thus the refusal of the Divine order is of great difficulty for him, yet invitation is certainly necessary because he is appointed for invitation. Consequently, he concords with the order: 'And directed as I ordered', and invites, even though he is observing the refusal of the invitation.

Thus the knowledge of the mysteries of *qadâ'* and *qadar* is not of the necessities of prophethood and envoyship. They are of the specialities of sainthood, and that the envoy and the prophet do not know them does not diminish them in their prophethood or envoyship, and when the envoy and the prophet attain to this knowledge, they attain to it through the aspect of their sainthood, and they do not attain to it through the aspect of their being envoy or prophet, because had it been so, they would have been extremely worried. However, at the moment they have left off inviting, they attain to this knowledge, at which moment they are lost to invitation in total annihilation in the Being of God in this worldly emergence, and equally by being transported to the other emergence. Thus, they are in the knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* according to these two ways. Finally, as there are certain differences in some orders and determinations between sainthood and prophethood, total communion between Khidr, who is the place of manifestation of sainthood, and Moses, who is the place of manifestation of prophethood, was not possible, except perhaps in

certain orders only, as the envoy is manifest by the determinations of envoyship and the saint by the determinations of sainthood.

Now let it be known like this, that Khidr was one of the Singular people, and the singulars are a group of people who are outside the determinations of the *qutb*. There is no dispensation in the *qutb* over them. The singulars among the human beings are like the *muhaymin* angels among the angels, who are *muhaymin* (lost in adoration) in the Beauty and Awe and Majesty of God. For them results the singulars of three from among the numbers, and those which are the threes beyond and above that. Of what is less than three there is no anteriority for them and for others, because uniqueness, which is one, is for the Ipseity of God, and two is for the degrees, and that is the Divine Unity (Divine Unification), and three is the first of the immanential being from God. The Presence of Singularity from the Divine Presences is specially for the singular and they are distinguished by that degree, and for them the Name Singular from among the Divine Names is special, and the Divine insertions which come upon their heart arrive from the station from which station it also comes upon the *muhaymin* angels. Also, their stations are made unknowable. Equally, they become denied with whatever thing they manifest of knowledge, state, action and works, just like Moses (S.A.) denied Khidr (S.A.) in spite of the existence of God's witnessing and explanation of the place of descent of Khidr to Moses.

The Shaykh (R.A.) says in chapter 30 of the *Futûḥât*, which is the chapter specially specialized for the singulars (*afrâd*), that: 'And these are a group of people outside the determination of the *qutb*, by themselves, and the *qutb* has no dispensation over them. For them from among numbers is the three and further higher (numbers). For the singulars and for others which are below the first singular there is only three, which is the most anterior, because indeed the uniqueness (the one and onliness) which is for the one, is for the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, and two is for the degrees and that is the Divine Union, and three is the being of the immanence from God. For the angels the singulars are the *muhaymin* angels which are lost in adoration in the Beauty of God and the Awe and Majesty of God. These are outside the angels which are subjected and which plan and conduct, who are distracted in the universe of registering and inscribing, and they are from the Pen and the Intellect, and on to below that. And the singulars from among the intimate ones (the human beings) are like the *muhaymin* ones from among

the angels, and are the first of the singulars of three. As the S.A. had said: "The three are the riders, and the first of the riders is the three, and on to what is above it." For them there is the Presence of Singularity from among the Divine Presences, and therein they are distinguished, and from the Divine Names of Singularity and from the matters that come to their heart from the station from whence it comes to the *muhaymin* angels, and for these their station is made unknowable, and it is not given to them (they are not acknowledged), just like Moses (S.A.) denied Khidr in spite of the attestation of God concerning it to Moses, and His letting him know of his place of descent and the praise that God gave him and with whom he had made a pact', and ended his words. In chapter 30 of the *Futûhât* again, he said concerning the place of descent and the knowledge of Khidr: 'It is the God's Munificence through Compassion and Mercy (*rahmah*) which is the origin of Khidr which God bestowed on him, and it is from such a Compassion and Mercy that he had this knowledge which Moses demanded that he teach him of, and if you have understood by this the order of which we have brought, you have come to know the value of the sainthood of this Mohammedian people and its general run of people and its place, and as the fruit and the flower is a branch from its origin, that which is ordained of it for the general public in the general public are those which is the origin of Khidr which God the High strengthened with His servant Moses (S.A.) with meeting him and educating him by it. It results for the Mohammedian the branch of the branch of the branch of the original of that which was the origin for Khidr. And if like Moses you want to know from him that which is his of knowledge, then look at the place of this Mohammedian gnostic and how it would result for you the origin to which reverts this branch. The Envoy (S.A.) said of what was shown to him from his Lord: Indeed God says: "The ones that are brought close to Me approach Me by the love for them of what they perform of what I have given them as obligation." This is that which is the origin of the performing of the obligation. Then He said: "And he will never cease to approach Me by the supererogatories", and those are what is added on to the obligations, but because of its genuineness it even is that its origin is the obligations. These are like the supererogatories of beneficial deeds like prayer and giving of the *zakât* and fasting, and the pilgrimage and the rememoration (*dhikr*), and these are the closest branches to the original. Afterwards, these acts result in what is the supererogatory of

the Divine Love given to him, and this is the special love as his desert and this is not the love with something in return, because the love with something in return is what all of the people of felicity associate in at the level of God, and those are which He bestows to whom He pleases that wants to approach God with the supererogation of beneficial deeds. After this there is that love which is the second branch which is at the same place of descent as the flower which results for him. Where God becomes the hearing and the sight and the hand of him is other than this. This is the third branch, and that is the place of descent of the fruit which was bound at the time of the flower, and when this is happened, then the servant hears by God, speaks by Him, sees by Him, strikes by Him and hears by Him and understands by Him, and this is the private Divine inspiration that this station bestows, without the Angel being the intermediary from God, and it is because of this that Khidr (S.A.) said to Moses (S.A.): "You have no information with which you can denigrate (my action)." As to the inspiration of the envoy, it is by the Angel between God and His envoy. There is no information to him by this taste during the signing of the determination in the universe of witnessing, and it is not customary the sending of the Divine determinations of religious legislation into the universe of witnessing except by means of the Spirit who descends with it to his heart, or in a form, and the envoy does not know the legalities of the religion except under this qualification and no other. And indeed the envoy is close by the conforming to the obligations and the love for him from God, and it does not result for him such a love as the closeness of the supererogatories and its love and what its love bestows. However, he knows of it by God, not from the knowledge of the religious legislation or the signing of the determination in the universe of witnessing, and he has no information with which to denigrate it, and things of this kind. This is the value of he who is specialized with it by Khidr other than Moses (S.A.)', and ended his words. Thus, understand these words and its detailing so that you understand the station of the envoy, the station of Khidr and the place of descent of the Mohammedian gnostic, so that you can distinguish between these (people).

And he knew by this what was agreed for Moses without his knowing of it, because had he known, he would not have denied a thing like this to Khidr for whom God had witnessed to Moses (and spoke of him) in praise and agreement. Yet with all that, Moses was forgetful of God's

praise of him (Khidr) and that he had made a condition that he would conform to him. Thus, because of Moses' denial, Khidr knew that thing with what Moses was agreed upon by God without his (Moses) knowing of it. That is to say, when he denied Khidr concerning the killing of the child, Khidr knew that Moses did not know upon what thing Moses was agreed by God. In other words, he did not know that he had killed it by the order of God. This sentence can also be interpreted as: the Envoy (S.A.) knew that thing upon which Moses was agreed by virtue of God's relating of it, while Moses did not know of it. In certain copies it is inscribed with the letter 'n' (*nûn*) which would then read: we know by what Khidr showed, what was agreed for him (Moses) without his knowing of it, which would mean that because of Moses' objection to Khidr it would be known what was agreed upon Moses while he did not know of it, because if Moses' act had been with knowledge he would not have denied a similar act upon Khidr, and such a Khidr which God the High had witnessed for at the level of Moses and had praised him and agreed to him. 'And you will come upon a servant from Our servants to whom We have given Mercy and Compassion from Ourselves, and taught him knowledge from Our Knowledge of the *ladun* (private knowledge to God).' Yet with all this, Moses forgot that God the High had praised Khidr to him and had been a witness for him. Equally Moses forgot the order by which Khidr had made a condition that he should conform to him in that condition to which Khidr had made their understanding conditional: 'And you will conform to me and you will not question anything until I bring it out to you in mention.' This means no question and no reproach. Even before he had entered into companionship with Khidr, Moses had said: 'May I conform to you so that you teach me of what you know of the secret path of rectitude?', thereby admitting the superiority and completion of Khidr by asking his permission of conforming to him because of knowledge. And in the same way he said: 'You will find me, God willing, patient and not contradicting you in any order.' Thus Moses had entered into a pact of companionship with Khidr where he had agreed to be patient and promised not to contradict him or revolt against him in greater orders, and after that he forgot it. **By mercy upon us if we forget the order of God.** That is to say, Moses forgot the praise of God the High out of mercy for us, so that if we forget God's order like Moses forgot and was not reprimanded for it, we will not be reprimanded because of our forgetting. **Had Moses been in knowledge of**

this, he would not have been told by Khidr: 'You have no information concerning it to denigrate me.' Had Moses known the acts and knowledge of Khidr, Khidr certainly would not have told him this. That is to say: how can you be patient with me where it concerns something for which you have neither information nor taste with which you encompass it? As if to say: 'I am upon a knowledge which does not happen to you from taste', which means that I am according to a knowledge from God, for which no knowledge through taste has been given to you. That knowledge is the knowledge of Union (*tawhîd*), knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* and knowledge of sainthood. Thus, when I manifest to you according to the image of that knowledge, how can you be patient when you are in accordance with the necessities and determinations of prophethood and envoyship? In fact, how could you possibly be patient? 'Just as you are according to a knowledge which I do not know', and did him justice, which means that you are upon a knowledge from God, which is the knowledge of religion and knowledge of envoyship, which I do not know. Thus Khidr did him justice. That is to say, he removed the knowledge through taste and information from Moses and pointed that it was special to himself through Divine instruction, and specialized for Moses the knowledge of religion, the knowledge of envoyship, and the descent of the Angel with Divine inspiration to Moses, and removed from himself this knowledge of religion and knowledge of envoyship and the descent of the Angel upon him with Divine inspiration. Thus he did justice to Moses, and did not say to him: 'I am better than you.' Rather that he knew the worth of Moses and whatever it was that Moses was without a doubt, and agreed with him in that which Moses had denied him (of) his companionship, because of his respect of Moses' station and his place of descent, since envoyship, which was the degree of Moses, necessitates question and argument, and Khidr knew this. That is why he resisted accepting Moses to his companionship, because he knew Moses was a prophet. But the wisdom of the separation is because of, or in accordance with, what God says concerning any envoy: 'Whatever the envoy brings to you, take it. Whatever he forbids you to do, forbid that to yourselves.' The knowledgeable people of God who know the value of the envoy and envoyship have stopped at these words. And in fact Khidr knew that Moses was envoy of God, and took from him, that which was in concordance with giving the envoy what was due of good form. It is true that God says in fact that what the envoy gives you, take, and what he

has forbidden you, abstain from, by which is meant that whatever he brings you through his envoyship, take it, and whatever he forbids you, abstain from it. It is at this level that the knowledgeable people of God have rested, and what is meant by the knowledgeable people of God are those complete *awliyâ'* who know the mystery of *qadar* and the mystery of *tawhîd* and sainthood. These are the people who know the value of envoyship which is the degree of collectivity and which is the place of total manifestation. Thus, being aware of the rank of the envoy, they receive the Divine order which arrives through the tongue of the envoy and abstain from what the envoy forbids, and they see that the envoy's due is respected. It was in fact true that Khidr knew that Moses was indeed an envoy of God. That is why he accepted to follow the orders that came from Moses, so that he rendered the due good form to the envoy. In other words, Khidr, being one of the knowledgeable people of God, knew the orders as they are with cognizance and inspiration, and knowing the height of the value of envoyship and the envoy, he undertook to concord with whatever order emanated from Moses and whatever order Moses gave him. The Shaykh (R.A.) in chapter 171 of his *Futûhât* says: 'Our Shaykh, Abu Najr, known as Abu Madyan: when Khidr knew the value of the degree of Moses and the height of his origin, obeyed him in what he forbade, in obedience to God and his envoy, because indeed God said: "Abstain from what he forbade you", and secondly Moses had said: "If I ask you again after this, do not be my friend." And he said (the Shaykh, Abu Madyan): (Khidr) heard and obeyed; and at the end he said to Moses: "I did not do anything of my own order. It was all according to the order of God and its way and method."'

And he said to him: 'If I ask of you anything again after this, do not befriend me', and forbade him from his conversation, but when it happened again for the third time, Khidr said to him: 'This is separation between myself and yourself.' Thus Moses, by saying that after this affair or after this time if I ask anything again do not befriend me, forbade him from his companionship. And when for the third time the same thing happened from Moses, then Khidr, knowing that he was arrested at the level of abstention by order, said to Moses: 'This is the separation between myself and yourself', by which Khidr, seeing that Moses had denied him from his companionship, out of good form and obedience to the dues of envoyship submitted to the order of

abstention, and by saying what he said, as he said, he pointed to the fact that it was according to Moses' order of abstention that was the cause of the separation between himself and Moses. Thus Khidr, in accordance with the good form due to the envoy, acted in accordance with the order of Moses. The Shaykh refers further to this subject in chapter 73 of his *Futûhât*. **Moses did not say to him: 'Do not do so', and did not require his companionship, due to his knowledge of the value of the rank in which he was, by which he had spoken to him through forbidding in any further companionship.** This is to say that when Khidr said to Moses: 'This is the separation between myself and yourself', Moses did not respond to him like before, and did not say to him: 'Do not undertake a separation between ourselves', and did not require his companionship, because Moses knew the value of the height of that rank in which Moses was individualized, and giving the due to the rank of envoyship which is the possessor of order and forbidding, did not require further conversation with Khidr. But in the first instances when he asked him for his companionship, he was concurring with his aspect of sainthood, not his envoyship. **And Moses fell silent, and separation occurred.** Thus Moses, having fallen silent on request of companionship, there occurred necessarily between them a separation. The Shaykh (R.A.) says on this matter in chapter 161 of his *Futûhât*: 'There is no doubt that among the prophets and people of religious laws are the highest of the servants of God among the sons of Adam. Nevertheless, there are servants who are specialized in superior knowledge which does not necessarily distinguish them as superior by this knowledge in which they are superior. Thus he said to Moses: "I have a knowledge which God has taught me (made me know) which He has not taught you, and you have knowledge which God has taught you which He did not teach me." But he did not say: "I am superior in knowledge to you." He knew what was due to Moses and obeyed the order of abstention from his companionship through respect to the station of Moses and the height of his station. And Moses kept silence at the time of their separation and did not retract his forbidding, because he knew from whom Khidr had heard the order of abstention of Moses and said to him: "I did not do it out of my own order", and Moses knew when they separated that the order was from his Lord, and did not object to the separation, and what was intended happened for Moses, and what God intended for Moses to know also happened as intended, and Moses knew that with God there are servants who have

knowledge which he himself has not, and this need not be only knowledge of immanences from among the immanences, or whether they be knowledges of insight (*kashf*), and these are also of the states of the *murîdûn*, people of *sulûk*, whether they be of knowledge appertaining to the Person of God or of strongly established knowledge or things that resemble these.'

Thus, Khidr having obeyed the order of abstention of Moses who was individualized in that degree, Moses in turn became obedient to the determination of that degree, and in the same way, Moses learned from Khidr from whom Khidr had heard that order of abstention, and equally he knew through Khidr's words: 'I did not do it of my own order' that Khidr did not leave him due to his own order; therefore he did not object to the separation. Thus, what was intended for Moses happened. and what God had intended as the informing of Moses also happened, because Moses learnt that there are servants for God for whom results Divine knowledge which does not happen at his own level, and equally he learnt that all actions happen through the order of God, thus Moses kept silence and his action results in silence. Look at the completion and perfection of these two men in knowledge, and the passing of the Divine good form where they are concerned, and the tolerance of Khidr when he confessed to Moses when he said to him: 'I have knowledge that God has taught me which He has not taught you, and you have knowledge that He has taught you which He has not taught me', and this proclamation from Khidr to Moses is the remedy for the wound that Moses suffered when Khidr said to Moses, though he knew the height of the degree of Moses: 'How can you have patience with me when no news of it has descended to you?', which degree Khidr did not have. The knowledge that Khidr had that Moses did not have was the knowledge of sainthood and knowledge of *tawhîd*. The knowledge which Moses had which Khidr did not have is the knowledge of establishing a religious law, and a knowledge of envoyship. This proclamation from Khidr had wounded Moses in his envoyship because Khidr knew perfectly well the height of the degree of Moses, which degree did not exist for Khidr, and that degree was the degree of envoyship and prophethood.

Now let it be known like this, that in its apparency these words show that Khidr is not a prophet, because Khidr singularized a knowledge for himself which Moses did not know. Equally he singularized a knowledge for Moses which he himself did not know, and that

knowledge is the knowledge of envoyship and prophethood, and Moses is an envoy and a prophet, and Khidr denied that knowledge from himself and did not establish it for himself. Had Khidr, during the companionship of Moses and Khidr, manifested with the determinations of prophethood, Moses would not have denied it because he would have manifested from his own degree. The Shaykh (R.A.) in chapter 30 of his *Futûhât* says: 'Khidr knew that Moses had no taste in the station that he, Khidr, was in, just as Khidr had no taste in the station that Moses was in of knowledge that God had taught him. It is that the station of Khidr does not bestow argument to anyone, to anything that God has created, in his particular witnessing according to him, whereas the station of Moses does bestow argument with another in all that is shown to him outside of with which he was envoyed, and the proof of this is in the way in which Khidr said to Moses: "How can you have patience . . .?"' Had Khidr been a prophet he would not have said this sentence, which he did because he was not of the station of prophethood, and he spoke to him with singularity for each of them in their station when he said to Moses: "I have a knowledge which you do not have . . .", and he separated from him and distinguished himself by denial. Denial is not from the businesses of the Singulars (*afrâd*) because for them there is the firstness in the orders in which they are denied by others but they do not deny.'

Now the gnostic Shaykh, Sadraddin-i-Konevi, says in his *Fukûk* in the *fakk* of the *faṣṣ* concerning the Mohammedian Sealhood: 'The totality of the determination of the religious law which he brought, the whole of the earth is the mosque for God and His people, and its earth is clean, and He inserted in the determinations of his envoyship the envoyship from the past of the envoys and those that remain of them, like Jesus (S.A.) and Elijah (S.A.), and in the same way, in the order of his prophethood inserts equally Khidr (S.A.) into this, and the people who are veiled are in opposition to one another in the prophethood of Khidr, but for the greater verifiers there is no variance among them in this matter.'

In appearance there is a difference between these two sayings (of 'Arabi and Sadraddin-i-Konevi). In fact in chapter 24 of the *Futûhât* the Shaykh (R.A.) says: 'All saints are prophets which are after the Sealhood unto the Day of Judgement, are similar to the prophets, are Mohammed (S.A.) in prophethood, like Elijah and Jesus and Khidr for these people', and again in chapter 46 of the *Futûhât* where he says:

‘The religious laws of all of them are knowledges of gifts, and those for whom there is not the knowledge of gift are a few of the saints without the religious law for their followers, of which for example is Khidr.’ There is contradiction even in these two sayings, in appearance. However, there is no doubt that there is no difference between these two sayings, and they are concordant in the aspect that Khidr is not a prophet with religious law, because Khidr’s words to Moses: ‘How could you have patience . . . ?’ are not words from the station of prophethood, because the word ‘news of’ is Divine knowledge without intermediary from God, arriving through taste, and the knowledge of the prophet which concerns prophethood is through the intermediary of an angel. Thus Khidr is individualized in the station of closeness, between prophethood of religious law and friendship, which station is the station of the Singulars which are outside the circle of the Pole (*qutb*), and the station of the Singulars does not necessitate argument with anyone. Consequently, in consideration of this, Khidr is a Singular and a saint, and is not a prophet of religious law, especially as the Shaykh (R.A.) says in chapter 73 of the *Futûḥât*: ‘Khidr is not a prophet of religious law which is particular to prophets (S.A.).’ However, the station of closeness is the station of absolute prophethood which one attains to through specialization. It sometimes happens that one attains to it through religious law activity, and sometimes it happens that one attains to it through the *tawḥîd* of the *ḥaqq*, and humility. And Khidr attained to this through the *tawḥîd* of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, in this station the special Divine inspiration is received from the *ḥaqq* through a private aspect without intermediary, and this kind of prophethood is fluent equally in other animals. The Shaykh (R.A.) says in chapter 155: ‘Like God said for His servant Khidr: “We gave him *rahmah* from Us and We taught him from Our *ladunî* Knowledge”, and this prophethood is fluent among animals, like in the (Quranic) words: “Your God inspired the bee”, and all are in this category as God taught the animals to speak and to praise, and the plants and the minerals, and taught the prayer to every one of His creation, and praise. Prophethood is fluent in all that is existent, and people of *kashf* and existence know this. However, these are not called by the words ‘*nabiyy*’ or ‘*rasûl*’, except the angels who are specifically for the envoys.’

According to this aspect Khidr becomes a prophet with absolute prophethood, but does not become a prophet through religious law. It

is possible that Khidr was subject to an envoy other than Moses and was in his law, and perhaps that the determination he was under was in opposition to the determination that Moses had. Thus Khidr determined with the killing of the young boy according to the religious law of that envoy to whom he was subjected, and that determination was in opposition to the religious law of Moses. That is how Moses denied it. Thus the killing of the young boy was not under the determination of Khidr, as Khidr was not the possessor of a religious law. In fact perhaps rather that where he is concerned, his determination in this matter from our point of view is similar to the determination of the religious judge who is under the religious law of the envoy (S.A.). Consequently, Khidr does not become a prophet of religious law, so understand!

As this became evident (that is, superiority by comparison) in the Mohammedian people in the case of the pollination of the date-palm and when he (S.A.) said to his companions: 'You know better the affairs of your world.' There is no doubt the knowledge of a thing is better than the ignorance of it, and by this God praised His own Self in that He knows everything. The affirmation of the confession of the S.A. to his companions in that they were more knowledgeable in the affairs of the world than himself is because he had no knowledge of it in this, and that is a matter of knowledge through taste and experience, and he (S.A.) had no branching into this knowledge. His business was most important, and yet even more important. By this I have awakened you to a grand good form. Profit from it if you apply yourself to it. This superiority in comparison became evident to the people of Mohammed in the case of the fertilization of the palm tree. One year the Envoy (S.A.) saw his companions fertilizing their date-palm by taking from the male tree to the female flowers, and the Envoy said to them: 'It would not matter if you left alone the fertilization', and because of these words they (the companions) did not proceed with the fertilization. That year few dates ripened. The Envoy (S.A.) then said to his companions: 'You are more knowledgeable in the affairs of your world.' It is without a doubt that to know something is preferable to being ignorant of it. It is because of this that God the High praised His own Self with the encompassing of everything, by the words: 'Indeed He encompasses everything.' Thus, the confession of the Envoy of God (S.A.) to his companions concerns their knowledge being superior to his own in the things of this world, since the Envoy (S.A.) had no experience and

knowledge in the affairs of this world, because in fact the knowledge of the affairs of this world results from taste and experience, and the Envoy (S.A.) had not worked with his heart for the knowledge of the affairs of this world. Rather perhaps his work was for the most important, and more important within the most important. In other words, knowledge of the partial orders is not necessary for the Envoy (S.A.). Rather perhaps what is necessary is the knowledge of total orders, because order of prophethood and envoyship depends on those. Ibn 'Arabi adds: 'In fact I have made you know of a great, grand good form. You should profit by it if you would use yourself according to that good form.'

Now, let it be known like this, that Khidr (S.A.) is the image of the Name Interior, and his station is the station of the spirit. For him result the knowledges of sainthood and closeness and the knowledges of the Unknowable and the mysteries of *qadar* and the knowledges of quiddity and the nature or quality of an *a posteriori* categorical proposition and the knowledges of the *ladun* (private knowledge) and the Divine mysteries. That is why the origin and extent of the taste of Khidr became grant and giving. God the High said: 'We have made a servant from among Our servants to whom We have given Mercy and Compassion from Us and made him knowledgeable from Our private Knowledge (*'ilm-i-ladun*).' Thus, in the words Khidr said to Moses there is a pointer to this above-mentioned knowledge. Consequently, he said: 'Your Lord willed it', and with the letter *kaf* of the second person he unified the Lord and defined the Lordship of the quiddity, and gave him news of the interior Lordly will (*irâdah*), and also he said 'He willed'. Thus he defined and conditioned it. Consequently, he gave news of the specialization of the knowledge of some of the wills which are in the interior. He also said: 'We willed to exchange for them a better one from their Lord as a gift of purification (*zakât*).' Thus, with the word 'We have willed' he collected together in composition, and this collecting together is exactly unification (*tawhîd*). And the taste for willing and dispensing (*taṣarruf*) and in knowledge and experience it is the singularity of knowledge. Consequently, all these are pointers at the mysteries of the interior *'ayn* and to the uniqueness of the will and knowledge and the mysteries of sainthood from Khidr (S.A.). In the same way, Khidr (S.A.) in his words: 'And He willed that I make it blameworthy', in the act of sinking the ship which is in common custom a blameworthy act, attributed it to himself,

for the purpose of transcending Him from the attribution of that act to Him which in appearance was a bad thing to do and blameable, whereas the pointing of the wall, which is a good act, he attributed to the *haqq* and said: 'Your Lord willed it.' In the case of the killing of the young boy he said: 'And we have willed to exchange him for them from their Lord.' Here he mentioned it with the letter *nûn* of collectivity, because in this matter there is from Moses' point of view blameworthiness since Moses (S.A.) had thought the young boy to be an intelligent self which was being killed by another self. Thus, in his view killing was blameworthy, whereas his killing was beneficial to his parents. Thus Khidr, having in one case attributed to his own self that which was blameworthy in current custom from the point of view of Moses, attributed to the *haqq* that which was good and merciful, and with the letter *nûn* of collectivity which collects together the Lord and Khidr he expressed it to Moses. However, Moses (S.A.), who is the image of the Name Manifest and whose station is the station of the heart, has for him resultant the knowledges of envoyship and prophethood and the knowledges of religious law, and for him there exists the determination to order with what is acceptable and forbid what is blameable in the manifest. Because of this, the miracles of Moses (S.A.) were in the completeness of clarity and manifestedness. Whenever Moses (S.A.) was in great satisfaction from the gifts of the Name of Manifest, the Will of God the High appertained to his (Moses') completion by willing for him a portion (side) of the determinations of the Name Interior, by collecting together that which was both of manifest and secret revelations and bringing together in his aptitudes of prophetic knowledge the knowledges of sainthood. Thus He sent him to the companionship of Khidr who is the place of manifestation of the Name Interior. In fact Moses (S.A.) was manifest among his people with a contention, which people were the most knowledgeable of the people of the earth. This contention was among a great congregation of the people of Israel. Hence God the High inspired Moses and said to him: 'Perhaps We have a servant in the collectivity of the two Seas', that is to say, the Sea of necessarily-so-ness and the Sea of possibilities, or the Sea of the manifest and the Sea of the interior, or again, in the collectivity of the Sea of prophethood and the Sea of sainthood. Consequently, Moses (S.A.) was ashamed of his contention, and asked of God the High that God decree a companionship between the two of them, and asked for permission in this demand and this coming

together so that Khidr may teach him what God the High had taught him. If Moses had been more inclined to the companionship of God the High and had taken from God the High the knowledge of sainthood, God the High would have made him rich beyond need of the companionship of Khidr. Thus, God the High preferred God's companionship and converse which irradiated from the revelations of the hidden interior and the Presence of Khidrness. Consequently, when there came about a meeting between Moses and Khidr there manifested an incompatibility between them, because there is opposition between manifesting and being hidden, and oneness and plurality, and prophethood and sainthood. It was after the arrival to Moses of the Divine knowledge from the companionship and converse of Khidr that God had planned to bring it (this Divine knowledge) to Moses, and, as it is explained, there was separation which occurred between Khidr and Moses. However, for the Complete Man who is the perfect heir of Mohammed (S.A.), who collects in himself the manifest and the interior, the prophethood and sainthood, due to his perfect conformity with him the perfect heir combines both the manifest and the interior and is observer over both sides and is realized by both sides. Just as Moses had manifested with denial at the level of Khidr, Khidr equally had manifested at the level of Moses with denial, even though it is true that the station of Khidr does not necessitate denial and objection because Khidr is of the Singulars and the degree of the Singular does not require denial and objection to anyone. Yet it was because Moses denied him that he denied the denial of Moses. With all this, he knew that the degree of Moses bestows denial. But the Mohammedian heir does not deny anything, and in the manner mentioned at the beginning of this book the story of Khidr and Moses passed in this way.

Now this, let it be known to you as it is mentioned before. With the words: 'And He ordered that I make it blameworthy', Khidr attributed to himself that which was blameworthy in the sinking of the ship due to transcending the Divine Person. But the rebuilding of the wall, which is mercy for the orphans, he attributed to God by the words: 'Your Lord willed it', as this was a matter of mercy and good. And in the matter of the killing of the boy, which according to the point of view of Moses was blameworthy whereas it was a mercy and compassion to the parents, Khidr said: 'We willed from their Lord to exchange them for them', using the collective form. Thus, where there is good in the matter he attributed to God, and that which was in

appearance and in Moses' point of view both blameworthy and not good he attributed to himself. It was first with the sinking of the ship, after that the killing of the boy, and in the third place with the rebuilding of the wall that Khidr was manifested. The wisdom of the order of this the Shaykh (R.A.) explains in chapter 31 of the *Futûḥât*, and says: Khidr brought this happening in the middle of the occurrences, between the matter of the ship and the matter of the wall. He did not bring it about at the beginning or at the end, so that that which was blameworthy in this matter is on the side of the ship, and in this matter that which was of good he brought to the side of the matter of the wall. If the matter of the boy had been either at the beginning or at the end, wisdom would not have allowed it, so that in every way it was cleansed so that nothing of good or its opposite be related to it. If it were at the beginning and the matter of the ship in the middle, the thing which was good for the parents of the boy in the matter of the boy would not have arrived, so that in appearance, according to the Presence of unknowableness which is the ship, it should pass on and in this way reach the goodness which is in the wall. If the matter of the wall were in the middle and the story of the boy at the end, the blameworthiness of the ship would not have arrived to the blameworthiness of the boy, so that it pass beyond the good that was in the wall. Consequently, that it should pass without relationship, because it is of the honour of the Presences that the essences of things, I mean, changes the quality as it is of the honour of the Presences of things that the essences pass by the side of things. Thus, the matter of the boy happened in the middle. Consequently, the aspect of the blameworthiness is on the side of the ship, and the aspect of good is from the side of the wall, and according to this consideration the Divine Wisdom has become straight, so understand!

And his word: 'And He gifted me, my Lord, with wisdom' means caliphate, 'and made me of the envoys' means envoyship, and not all envoys are caliphs. The caliph wields a sword and can dismiss and can appoint, but the envoy is not like this. For him there is only to announce with what he has been sent. If he fights for it and protects it with the sword, that man is a caliph and an envoy. When Moses spoke these words concerning the gift of the Lord with wisdom, he meant by it the caliphate, and by saying that he was sent as an envoy he meant that he was an envoy. Thus, each envoy is not a caliph, and an envoy is not like a caliph who can use a sword and can appoint and dismiss. The

envoy only announces, as the Quranic saying: 'There is not for the envoy except announcement.' If the envoy, for the purposes of the order with which he has been sent, has to fight, that is to say, after having announced the Divine order, to maintain alive the religion and the determinations of the law of the religion he has to fight with the deniers and the obstinates and protect with the sword those who have entered within the boundaries of the religious law and the Divine order, then that person is both a caliph and an envoy. Consequently, caliphate is an added degree in envoyship. In the same way, all prophets are not envoys, just as all envoys are not caliphs, that is to say, those who have not received a domain and determinations in it. But Moses, with the words: 'My Lord, He gifted me with wisdom and brought me as an envoy', explained that he was both caliph and envoy, and this degree was not given to Khidr.

After this the Shaykh (R.A.) explains the wisdom of the question of the Divine Quiddity posed by Pharaoh to Moses, and says: **And the wisdom of the Pharaoh's question on the Divine Quiddity was not from ignorance, but it was for the purpose of gathering intelligence so that he could see from his (Moses') answer in the matter of his pretension of envoyship from his Lord, and Pharaoh knew the degree of the envoys in knowledge, and inferred from his answer as to the veracity of his pretension, and he asked him a question with a double meaning (amphibological) because of those who were present, so that they do not perceive (realize, were not aware) when he would understand himself in his own self from the question. Pharaoh asked Moses this amphibological question concerning the Divine Quiddity not due to his ignorance but so as to see from the answer that Moses would give whether his answer would be concordant with his pretension to envoyship. The Pharaoh knew the degree of knowledge of the envoys in the Divine knowledge, and consequently knew that when envoys were questioned about the Quiddity of God they would not answer with an answer composed of genera and division which composes the Quiddity of a definition, and in the same way, they do not answer by the Reality of Uniqueness or the Quiddity of the *haqq*, and they answer by His attributions. In this way the Pharaoh would understand through the answer of Moses the veracity of his pretension, and those present would not, because of the amphibological question that Pharaoh posed, because they had no knowledge of this which the Pharaoh in his own self knew. The reason why the Pharaoh resorted to such a procedure was because**

those present in the court of Pharaoh were people of wisdom, intelligence, and masters of reason and theory. They used to compose quiddity from genera and division and they used to compose a definition for everything from genera and division, and they used to call that definition the Quiddity, so that when the Pharaoh asked his question in front of them concerning the Quiddity of God, his question referred to the Quiddity which was composed of genus and division according to the ancient terminology, and consequently his question concerning the Absolute Reality of God and His total Quiddity became a conjectural question. The amphibology that the Pharaoh brought in his question concerning the Quiddity of God was not composed of genera and division, so that he could interpret the answer to those present due to their non-comprehension of that which Pharaoh in his own self knew. That is to say that there is for God Quiddity and Reality other than Being. This Pharaoh knew, and he explained this in his amphibological question, knowing well that the knowledge of the Quiddity is necessary for the pretension of prophethood to the prophet. Also, Pharaoh knew that God cannot be defined. That is why he asked his question, demanding the knowledge of the quiddity of the thing with the interrogative pronoun *mâ*, and he who asks with *mâ* requires the reality of a thing, and it is necessary for the reality of everything but it is not necessary or possible that the Reality and Quiddity of God be composed of genera and division so that knowledge of Him could be obtained by a definition. Under these considerations, in the word '*bimâ sha'ar*' the word '*mâ*' bears the meaning 'that is', and takes the objective case for the word 'that they know', and the word in his question refers to the word 'they know'. Consequently, Pharaoh's question was according to two aspects. And when he answered, he answered according to those who know the order. Thus, when Moses answered with the words: 'Lord of the heavens and the earth and that which is between them, if you are of those who are certain in knowledge', he answered with the answer of those who know the order of Reality in Divine Knowledge, because though one can ask of the Quiddity with the word '*mâ*', and the Divine Quiddity is the Absolute Ipseity, one may not answer from It, and Its qualification and explanation are not possible except by relationships, attributions and Names and Qualities. The Name Lord is not of the Names of attribution, and Lordship was known by those people. Consequently, when Moses answered with the words: 'Lord of the heavens and of the earth and of that which is between them' he

referred to the height of the heavens and low earths, and he included the superior spirits of Nature and the people of the lower elements, as the absolute Lordship collects in itself all the totality of partial Lordships, and attributing to God he qualified Him with it. He even included into God's absolute Lordship the partial extent of Lordship which the Pharaoh had attributed to himself with his words: 'I am your most high Lord', and he specialized all the degrees of high and manifestations of the low Lordships to God, and pointed at the fact that the Reality of the God in respect of His being Himself, no one else other than Him can know, by his words which he added: '... if you are certain in your knowledge', meaning, there cannot be a more complete description with the relationships of the Ipseity and the external qualifications, that is, if you are people of secure knowledge and reason. Consequently, Moses did not compose his answer according to the ancient terminology, composing it from genera and division, because he knew that what Pharaoh meant by his question concerning the Quiddity of God was not the Quiddity composed of genera and division, even though the wise people who were present understood it that way. Thus Moses was very much to the point in his answer, and the Pharaoh knew that Moses' answer was very much to the point and that he was true in his pretension. But because of maintaining his position before those present, he did not confirm Moses and become a believer. **The Pharaoh showed, to maintain his position, that Moses did not answer his question.** That is to say, when Moses answered the Pharaoh concerning the Quiddity of God, the Pharaoh, to maintain his position before the knowledgeable people who knew the order, manifested the fact that Moses' answer was not an answer to his question. That is to say, Pharaoh knew that Moses answered him but he was afraid of the people of his country, that they would know the degree of Moses and would believe in him and that rulership and dominion would pass away from his hands. So the people of his court, the wise and the knowledgeable ones, thought that the Pharaoh had asked of Moses for a Quiddity which in accordance with their own terminology would be composed of genus and division in answer to Pharaoh's question. Consequently, when Moses did not answer according to their terminology but answered in concordance with Pharaoh's knowledge and intention, Pharaoh immediately turned to the wise and the knowledgeable in his hall, and said: 'Do you not hear? He did not answer with the definition which the question with *mâ* requires.' In other

words, what did I ask him of and with what did he answer me? And it became evident to those present, due to the shortness of their understanding, that the Pharaoh was more knowledgeable than Moses, and this is because he spoke to him in his answer as distinguished from *mâ*. Thus, at the level of those present it was manifest, due to the shortness of the understanding, that indeed Pharaoh was more knowledgeable than Moses, and this was due to the fact that in his answer to Pharaoh Moses had given an answer as distinguished from *mâ*, because when one is questioned from the Quiddity of God, that which is necessary is to answer with an answer that questions the Quality. And this was in appearance other than an answer to what was asked of him, and Moses' answer appeared to be not a proper answer, concerned the Quiddity and the answer the Qualifications, and the answer was not suitable to the question because at the level of those present the question concerning the Quiddity should have been answered with a definition composed of genera and division. And it was established in the knowledge of the Pharaoh that he would not answer except by this, which means that the Pharaoh definitely knew that he would not answer by any other answer, that is to say, he would only answer by Qualities particular to God. And he said to his friends: 'In fact your envoy which has been sent to you is a madman', as if the knowledge I asked of him was veiled from him. In fact it cannot be imagined that that could be known. The truth is that it cannot be imagined that God could be known by any other than God Himself. But these words of Pharaoh have also two aspects. One is the apparent meaning that this envoy of yours which has been sent to you is a madman. That is to say, the knowledge of what I asked him is veiled from him and he cannot understand what I asked him. In this way he appeared before them as more knowledgeable than Moses. The other aspect is that at their level it testifies Moses' envoyship, meaning that the knowledge of the thing that was asked of him is veiled from him because in reality the Reality of God is not known by any one person, and also, the envoy during his envoyship is veiled and covered from the realities of things and the mystery of *qada'* and *qadar*. Consequently, his duty is not to invite to the Absolute Ipseity but to invite to the Divine Qualities, and if he were to be questioned of the Ipseity he would answer by the Qualities. And the question (Pharaoh's) is true in that the question of the Quiddity is questioning of the reality of what is required, and it is without a doubt that He is in His own Self according to a reality. In these words the

Shaykh (R.A.) points at the falsity of the thing which is established in the people themselves, because they say that Pharaoh with his words: 'What is the Lord of the universes?' (*wa mâ rabb al-'âlamîn*) is not a true question because it queries of the Quiddity, and in their belief Quiddity is composed of genera and division, whereas for the God there is no Quiddity composed of genera and division, hence they say the question is untrue. The Shaykh (R.A.) says that questioning of the Quiddity is questioning of the reality of that which is required, and it is without a doubt that that which is required is according to a reality in Itself, and for God, which is the Reality of Realities, it would be necessary that there was no reality, and this is erroneous. **But for those who bring a definition composed of genera and division, it is so in everything in which there happens to be association, but for that which has no genera, it is not necessary that it should not have (a reality) for another.** In other words, those who compose the definition of things from genera and division, the definition of quality exists in everything in which there is association of genera. And if it were queried of the quiddity of a thing who is defined in this way, the answer would be with the definition which would be of its quiddity, but for someone for whom there is no genera, it is not necessary that it should not be according to a reality in itself, which reality should not be valid for something other than itself. Thus the One Existent, for whom there is no genera, Its Reality is not limited by a definition which is composed of genera and division. Consequently, because of the non-existence of a genera, and because of the impossibility of applying Its Quiddity to that condition, it is not necessary that God is not according to a reality so that God should not be in Its Ipseity according to a reality where that reality is particular to Himself. Thus, the Reality of God, which is the Reality of Realities, does not enter into the category of genera and division so that it would be an untrue question to question of It, because the Reality of God is established from all eternity and previousness, before the creation of all that is creation which establishes the definition of things, and remains so for ever and for all time. Thus, to query of It is true, but to answer it is untrue except by relationship and attribution. **And the question is true for the people of the Way of God, and the knowledge is true and the intellect is free from all defect (*salîm*).** Thus, to query of the Quiddity of God is true for the Way of the people of God, according to the requisites of the true knowledge and for the intellect which is free from all defect. But in the belief of those who have no

comprehension and understanding and subtlety of intellect it is not true. And the answer to this cannot be except by what Moses answered. Thus, there cannot be an answer to the question of the Quiddity of God except in the way that Moses answered it, that is to say, as he answered by the quality of Absolute Lordship. Consequently, Moses' answer was also true. And here is a great mystery in that he answered the one who asked the definition of the Ipseity with Its action, and he made the definition of the Ipseity the same as Its attribute which It manifests with in the images of the universe, or in which manifests the images of the universe, or by which He manifests from the images of the universe. It is as if he said in his answer to the words: 'And what is the Lord of the universes?', he answered by saying: 'That in which manifests the images of the universe, from the height which is the heavens, and from the low which is the world, if you are of certain knowledge, or He manifests with it.' That is to say that there is a great mystery in the way Moses answered, in that in fact Moses answered the person who queried about the definition of the Ipseity with the Lordship which is the action of God. Thereby Moses made the definition of the Ipseity, which is the Lord, the same as the attribute of that thing by which the Lord manifests in the images of the universe, or equally, he made the attribution of Lordship the same as that which manifests in the Being of the Lord as the images of the universe. In other words, he made the attribution of Lordship to the universes the same as the definition of the Ipseity. It is as if he said to the Pharaoh in answer to the Pharaoh's question, 'What is the Lord of the universes?': 'It is that One Being in whom manifest the images of the universe, in the height of the universe, which is the heavens, and the lowness of it, which is the earth.' In other words, the Lord of the universes is that One Being in whom are manifested the higher images of the universe which are the heavens, and the lower images which are the earth, that is, if you have certitude in knowledge. Equally, it is as if he said: 'It is that One Being who manifests with the images of the universe.' Consequently, it is either that the Being of God is the Lordly manifestation in the higher and lower images of the universe, where the essences of the universe are the mirrors and planes of reflection for the One Being of God, or that the Being of the One God is the One mirror for the essences of the universes, in which the images of the essences are reflected with the *rahmân* and manifested and individualized with Lordship. Consequently, under both considerations, the images of the universe derive

nourishment from the Being of the *ḥaqq*. Thus the words: 'Lord of the heavens and of earth and of that which is in between' is to attribute Lordship to the images of the universe, is tantamount to making the Lord a definition of the Ipseity. Thus, the manifestation of God in the images of all the essences of the universe, and the manifestation of the images of the essences of the universe in the mirror of God, becomes the definition of the Ipseity of God and the Being of God.

The words 'manifests therein' is the speaker of what is said in the word 'he said', and in the words 'he said that' the word 'he said' is repeated, because there has been an insertion between the word 'he said' and the speaker, the phrase in the answer of 'he said', and also the phrase 'and what is the Lord of the universes?', and the second 'he said' was put in due to the length of the speech. The Shaykh (R.A.) often resorts to this sort of thing in his speech, and it is not there due to a mistake by the scribe. When the Pharaoh said to his company: 'He is mad', just as we mentioned in the meaning of the madness of Moses, Moses increased in his speech so that the Pharaoh knows his degree in the Divine knowledge, because he knew that Pharaoh would know this, and he said: 'Lord of the East and of the West' and gave rank, situation, to by what He is manifest and veiled, and He is the manifest and the hidden and that which is between, and He by His saying knew everything. Thus Moses in his answer brought in that which acknowledges Lordship (*marbûb*), which is manifest, and that thing is the place of manifestation because the East is the place of manifestation, and God is hidden and veiled from it by the universe of spirits and order, and that thing is the place of veiling because the West is the place of waning, and God is manifest in the bodies of the universe which is the place of manifestation, and is hidden in the universe of spirits which is the place of veiling. Equally, the Lord is the East by the fact that He is individuated and manifest in everything that is manifest in the universe of witnessing, and He is Lord and Possessor of it, and He is hidden and veiled by the relationship which is manifest in the universe of the Unknown, and the Lord is the West, and the West in comparison with the Unknowable is equally manifest therein, and is the Lord and Possessor of it. The words: '... and that which is in between' is the words of God: 'And He encompasses everything.' That is to say the individuation of things, which collects the spirits and the bodies between the manifest and the hidden, because the East is for manifestation and the West is for the interior, and that God is both manifest

and individuated by the levant of His Life in the totality of things which are manifested, and He is interior and individuated in all the things which are in the interior, and equally, certain individuations are aspected from the interior towards the manifest, and some are from the manifest towards the interior. Thus He knows the totality of things and is there Possessor, whether they be manifest or interior and whether they are individuated between manifestation and interiority. If you are of people of intellect and comprehension, that is, if you are people of limiting, because indeed the intellect is limiting. Because in fact people of limiting and definition either limit the *ḥaqq* by immanencing the *ḥaqq* through comparison to the bodies, or they transcend Him from being a body. Thus they limit or condition or define God by immanencing God or comparing with spirits and intellects. Thus even their transcendence is conjectural, because under scrutiny it is immanencing and comparing (*tashbîh*). And the first answer is the answer for the people of certainty (*yaqîn*). and they are the people of insight (*kashf*) and being, and he said to them: 'If you are of the people of certainty', that is to say, people of insight and being. Certainly you have understood by which you are certain in your witnessing and in your being. Thus the first answer is: 'Lord of the heavens and of earth', and this is the answer for those who have certainty and they are people of insight and being, and he said to them: 'If you are of those who have certainty', that is to say, if you are people of insight and being. Then in fact I have expressed to you with that by which you have certainty of it through your insight and being. In other words, if you are people of insight and witnessing, then you must by needs have certainty through your certainty in your insight and being that one cannot answer from the Reality of God except by attribution. Thus I have expressed it to you in my answer and according to that by which you have certainty through your witnessing and being, and if you are in the circle of witnessing, you have certainly understood my answer. The reason why Moses started in his answer to the question on the Quiddity by indirect answer, and his answering with an action, is announcement that God, in consideration of His Reality, is Absolute from all definition or conditioning or limiting, and is not entered under any genera and is not distinguished from another division, because He is a total Essence and encompasses all things and all things are in annihilation in Him. Thus he changed over to the declaration of the Reality of Lordship by declaring that which is of Divine attribution, so that the Lordship of the universe of higher

spirits and the lower bodies, and the Lordship of the relationships and attributions of those which are individuated between them, is particular to Him, and is manifest by Lordship for all, and He is with His Quiddity interior in the all, because in the witnessing and in the being He is the same as the universes. This is a pointer and a warning that the description of God is impossible except in this way, by attribution to all or by attribution to some, like in the words (God's): 'Your Lord and the Lord of your first ancestors.' And if you are not of this class, I have in fact brought to you in the second answer, if you are people of intelligence and conditioning and you have encompassed God in the proofs that your intellect has bestowed to you. And Moses appeared in both these aspects so that Pharaoh knew his superiority and his veracity. The second answer refers to Moses' saying: 'Lord of the East and the West and of that which is in between', because the words 'Lord of the East and the West' are also conditional and relative and limiting. Thus, even though Moses addressed the Pharaoh and the people who were present in his court with the plural pronoun, addressing equally the Pharaoh and the knowledgeable people, yet Moses' intention was to express to Pharaoh his own superiority and truth, because Moses understood the understanding capacity of the Pharaoh. And Moses knew that the Pharaoh knew this, or that he would know it. That is, because Moses knew that Pharaoh would understand his answer immediately, or would come to understand it. As he happened to ask of the Quiddity, he (Moses) knew that his question was not according to the terminology of old but a question with *mâ*. Moses knew that because they do not find permissible or proper to question in this way of the Quiddity of a Being which is not definable by a definition composed of genera and division. It is because of this that he answered, because he knew the Pharaoh's understanding, and that is why he answered the Pharaoh. And if he (Moses) had known anything other (concerning) than this error in the question, and when Moses brought that which was asked of him as being the same as the universe, the Pharaoh addressed him with this tongue, and the people (of Pharaoh) did not understand. That is, if Moses (S.A.) had understood anything other than this from the Pharaoh, he would have found fault with his question and would not have answered him, but when Moses made God which was asked of him the same as the universe, the Pharaoh addressed him in this manner of speech which is the tongue of *tawhîd*. However, the people had no knowledge of the treatment of the subject between Moses and

Pharaoh and of the knowledge that Pharaoh had. And he said to him: 'If you will take a god other than me I shall make you of the imprisoned (*masjûnîn*)', and the letter 's' in the word '*sijn*' is of the unnecessary extra letters, as if to say: 'We shall cover you up; and in fact you obliged me to affirm to you by what I have said to you, a saying like this.' Thus, as Moses made God the same as the universe, and the Pharaoh being an image from the universe, and as God is the same as his essence, he said to Moses: 'If you take a god other than me I will surely make you of those who are incarcerated', and in the word 'prison' in Arabic the letter *sîn* is an unnecessary letter, and extra letters are collected from the quiddity of the heavens, and when the letter *sîn* is eliminated, what remains is *jin*, and *jin* is covering up, as God says: 'And when the night covered them up' (Quran). Cover up, that is, I will certainly cover you up, because in fact by your answer you made it certain that I should say to you words like this, that is to say, like: 'I am your most high Lord.' You are the cause of the emergence of these words from me, and you confirmed me in these words, thus equally, I, in accordance with your answer, cover the quiddity of your Mosesness. Pharaoh, before his belief, was the possessor of the knowledge of *tawhîd*, and in his pretensions was a squanderer, and he was from among the number of those people for whom the Envoy (S.A.) said concerning them: 'Most wicked of people who will rise on the Day of Judgement and they will be alive', that is to say, before their real death in God and the passing away of their 'me'-ness, knowing the mystery of *tawhîd* and the great Day of Judgement. Thus, due to his knowledge of *tawhîd*, he pretended to Divinity by his own individuation, and invited the people to his own self due to his knowledge of *tawhîd*, because the person who has knowledge of *tawhîd* understands the tongue of allusion, but had he been a person who possessed the *tawhîd* of witnessing and taste, he would not have pretended. Thus, when the Pharaoh understood that Moses was a unifier (*muwahhîd*) and speaks with God, he found an occasion to pretend to Divinity, because in this manner of speech any other being than God is devoid of being, and God, equally, in Lordship and in revelation, is varied in manifestation and determinations. Thus, for the degree of the Lord manifest in the image of Pharaoh in that congregation, there is determination over the Mosaic degree. Thus, Moses confirmed the Pharaoh with the tongue of unification and fortified him in his pretension by virtue of rank of rulership and manifestation of power. Consequently, when this

language became the tongue of allusion. the Pharaoh in his own speech took the letter *sîn* of the *siġn* as an extra letter and there remained *jin* which is to cover up; even though the word '*jin*' is not grammatically a double-fold three-letter radical or four radicals where either the second or third letter is the same letter, or where the first pair of letters is the same as the last pair, yet in this language, which is the language of allusion, one does not necessarily consider position or etymology or derivation. This is a tongue of allusion, not a language of sentences or clauses couched in a specific tongue. Consequently, in alluding to a certain meaning in that language, a few letters of the word is enough to indicate the meaning. 'If you might have said to me with the language of allusion: "Oh Pharaoh, you have shown your ignorance with your promise, when we are of the One Essence, and how do you differentiate?"' That is to say, Pharaoh would have said to Moses: 'Oh Moses, if you had told me with the language of allusion: "Oh Pharaoh, you have indeed been ignorant of the order of *tawhîd* by virtue of what you promised to do to me, whereas it is that there is only One Essence. Thus, under this observation, by what modality do you differentiate?"' That is to say, in other words, by addressing me with your promise in the words that you will cover me up, you have appropriated the promise to your own self by the form of the desinence (form which a word assumes when declined or conjugated) of the speaker. The Pharaoh would have said: 'When the degrees are differentiated the Essence is not differentiated. The Essence is not divided in Its Essence, and my degree at the moment is determination over you, Oh Moses, effectively, and I am you in the Essence and other than you in degree', and when Moses (S.A.) understood this, he gave him his due in his existence, as though in his existence Moses said to him: 'You are not able to do that.' What necessitated the words: 'If you might have said to me' is the Pharaoh, who said to Moses: 'If you asked to me', then what is due to that question is again from the tongue of Pharaoh in the desinence of the speaker himself, and would mean '*fayaqûl*', but an indirect desinence is derived from the speaker and the action is attributed to the Pharaoh in appearance because of alluding to the meaning of *tawhîd*. It is as if the Pharaoh descended his self to the station of the indirect (speaker), and says: 'The Essence is not differentiated. Rather perhaps the degrees differentiate the Essence, and that also the Essence in Itself did not become divided, because differentiation happens only in the degrees. The division is relative, not a real

order, and what is, Oh Moses, now the degree I am in is effectively to determine over you, because in the apparent image the degree which is made mine has possession of determination and it is allowable that a promise should emanate from me. With the Essence my 'me'-ness is the same as your 'me'-ness. That is to say, in consideration of One Essence my being is your being, and in consideration of degrees it is other than yours, and that degree is in effect the degree of determination over you.' Consequently, when Moses (S.A.) understood this from the Pharaoh, he bestowed his due to Pharaoh and said: 'You are not capable of doing this', even though he was agreeing, because in *tawhîd* the Pharaoh has no power and he cannot be attributed any action and power. From the aspect of this annotation, the words '*fa-in qulta*' emanate from the Pharaoh, and the word '*fayaqûl*' is its answer. However, it is also possible that the words '*fa-in qulta*' are the words of Moses. Then it would mean: 'If you were to say to me these words in this tongue', then the words: 'You have been ignorant' becomes its answer. And the rank, that is, the rank of the Pharaoh, was a proof for him for his power over him (Moses) and in manifesting the effects of his power there, because as God is individuated in the dignity of Pharaoh, there results in that company from the point of view of the apparent image determination for that dignity, according to that dignity where Moses' appearance happened to be, because from the point of view of the apparent image, Pharaoh was manifested with the sword over everything with determination. Thus, the degree wherein Moses is manifested is under the effect of the apparent image of the other, but in the interior image the manifestation of the degree which is in Moses is higher than the manifestation of the degree which was in Pharaoh. God had said to him: 'Do not be afraid; indeed you are the superior.' And in that way in the result of the order this is evident from the superiority of Moses over the Pharaoh. However, in that company the Pharaoh in his manifested image had determination over Moses. And he said to him, showing to him (the Pharaoh) that which would prevent him in his animosity towards himself: 'If I brought to you an evident thing?', and the Pharaoh was unable to say anything other except: 'Do it, if you are of the truthful', so that the Pharaoh would not appear in the eyes of the weak, and as in certain copies: intolerant in the eyes of the weak from among his people. Thus Moses said to Pharaoh when it was evident of the Pharaoh what would prevent his animosity over Moses: 'If I brought to you something evident?' If I brought to you an evident

proof, can you then show your animosity to me? It was as if Moses was manifested by God with evident acts (*âyat*) and manifest miracles, and he was certain of the manifestation of those acts, over which the Pharaoh would have no power to show opposition (animosity). In other words, he meant: as I am corroborated (underlined) with Divine miracles and appear with them, you have no power to show your animosity over me. Thus the Pharaoh was astonished into silence and was unable to say to Moses anything other than: 'Do it, if you are of the truthful.' That is to say, he said to him: If your pretension is true, bring that evident thing. And Moses' words caused the Pharaoh to say this so that he would not appear in the eyes of the weak from among his people clothed in intolerance. In the word 'intolerance' the letter 'b' is for the purpose of clothing, dressing. That is why the phrase reads: '*bi-'adam al-inṣâf*', literally meaning 'without being clothed in tolerance'. They doubted in this matter, but this company of people are the ones that the Pharaoh scorned, but they obeyed him. They were an iniquitous people. That is, they were outside the intelligence in that which the true intellect bestows for denial of what the Pharaoh pretended with his apparent speech. Thus the people have doubted, where it concerns the people of Pharaoh who were of weak vision. They were that lot of people who the Pharaoh scorned, yet they obeyed him. Surely they were an iniquitous people. That is to say, they were beyond the limits of that which would determine in intellect concerning Pharaoh's pretension in his apparent speech, and of what the true intellect would bestow for rejecting it. In other words, true intellect denies the Pharaoh's contention through his apparent speech, but the people of insight and essence and witnessing and certainty do not deny this, because there is no being other than the Being of God. Thus the people of Pharaoh were outside the limits of what true intellect bestowed for denial. That is to say, they stayed at the level of the thing that the Pharaoh spoke with the apparent speech. That is why the Shaykh said: that which the Pharaoh pretended with the apparent speech in intelligence, because in intelligence Pharaoh did not pretend Lordship in any other way than apparent speech. Because in fact for it, that is, for intelligence, there is a limit where it stops, even though people of insight and certainty go beyond it. Thus, there is a limit for the intelligence at which the intelligence stops and does not go beyond it, and denies what shows beyond that. The people of insight and certainty have no such limit at which they stop. They confirm

whichever image God reveals Himself in, whether it be an image that the true intellect sees as impossible, or whether it be an image that it admits, because they are people of certainty. Gabriel, who is the place of manifestation of Intellect, said: 'When the fingertips are close to that which might burn them, they stop.' It is because of this that Moses brought in his answers that which would be acceptable to those of certainty and to those specially of intelligence. That is to say, because the intelligence stops at a certain limit, and because the people of intuition go beyond the limit, Moses brought in the first answer that which only the people of certainty would accept, and in the second part of the answer that which is acceptable to the specialty of the intellectual, because that answer is specially for the intellectual, and the people of certainty do not stop at that level. And he threw his stick. So, as the Pharaoh said: 'Do', Moses threw his stick down, and that is the image by which the Pharaoh rebelled against Moses in his denial of agreeing to Moses' invitation. The stick (*'aṣāh*) is derived from *'iṣyān* which is 'rebellion'. That is why the image of the Pharaoh's action became a proof against him. It is also the image of the Pharaoh's *nafs-i-ammārah* (the ordering self), whereas in relation to Moses the stick is a snake which is the image of the secure self. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) has explained what took place between Pharaoh and Moses in their discussion in the way of allegory. That is why he said: 'And it was the image by which the Pharaoh rebelled against Moses in his denial.' Thus, if the self in the place of manifestation which was Pharaoh was not docile but instead obeyed the passion which is the equivalent of the heart which is the speaking *nafs*, and if conjecture and Satan were in control of it, the ordering *nafs*, due to its being conquered by its passion, becomes proud and denying, and having denied it refuses. But if the self, as in the place of manifestation which was Moses, was docile to God and obeyed the heart which is the speaking *nafs*, and is illumined by the light of the spirit, it becomes a stick in which he has confidence in his actions and in the obtaining of superior characters and beliefs and in its travels, and brings down useful leaves of knowledge from the tree of reason over the sheep of his animal powers, and helps him in all his quests by collection of proofs and indications and reaping of superior and complete purposes, and the clearly apparent snake which the Pharaoh with his self used to misrepresent the similarities of powers of conjecture and imagination in his people, and uses it for his revenge. All the above-mentioned perfections of the

self result for the heart and spirit that is Moses through its obedience. And if it is clearly the serpent, that is to say, the manifested snake, it is that disobediences, which are sins, have been changed to obedience, that is, to good deeds, like He says: 'God changes your misdeeds into good deeds' (Quran), that is to say, in determination. Thus, if the stick became an evident serpent, that is to say, a manifested snake, everybody witnessing the snake decides that it is a snake. However, the disobedience, which is a misdeed, changed into obedience, which is a good deed, just as God said: 'God changes your misdeeds into good deeds', which means that in determination God changes their misdeeds into good deeds. *Aṣāh* is derived from *ma'ṣiyah* which means 'rebelliousness'. Consequently, when the *'aṣāh*, the stick, was a plant, its turning into an animal is its changing of rebellion to obedience. And God said: 'Thus God changes your misdeeds into good deeds.' Hence, when the human self in its own nature was in rebellion against its own spirit and its own heart, knocking down its reprehensible passions and taking it into trust and safekeeping, it becomes in obedience like a vegetable self. Thus it became compared to a stick in docility, and in non-action by its own self, and then, having become alive as a snake from its animal qualities with the Divine life and spirit which is obtained from the heart, becomes alive like a snake, and its human sinful existence changes into the godly feelingful existence. That the change-over and progress happens in the determination is due to the wisdom that rebellion is an order of relativity and it has no being in the realities and in the essences, and it attaches itself to one due to the lack of obedience. Thus returning to its origin and source which is the Being of God, or else, if the human being is full of the Divine effusion and revelation of the Lordly characters, the determination of rebelliousness is lifted from him because the branches are subject to the origins. Consequently, an action or a deed which is under the determination or the image of rebelliousness in consideration of external order, changes into a determination and image of obedience. However, it does happen that a certain self at times is manifest with the determination of rebellion, and it happens at times that it is manifested with the determination of obedience, but as the rebelliousness is a sin and is an imaginary order, it is changed into a good deed which is obedience in determination as there is no existence of sin in the Essence, so that you could say sin does not become a good deed, because there is no change in the Essence, especially so that in the union of action all

action is attributed to God, as the self is qualified with the Divine Qualities, whether the *nafs* is manifest with the fury and destruction or just determination and munificence. Thus the order manifests with God, and His actions, even though they are in the images of mischief like Khidr killing the young boy, but in reality they are the same as truthfulness because it is through the Divine order and its actor is God. 'That which you have cut because it was limp, or left them to stand erect according to their origin, it is all through the permission of God.' **And it became manifest the determination here exactly differentiated in one being and that is the stick and it is alive and a manifested snake.** The determination in its last image is a manifest snake. Thus, that which is the vegetableness of the stick is one jewel which manifested over the determination of stickness as a differentiated essence over the stick which was the image of Pharaoh's rebellion, and in the same way, when the stick which was the one jewel manifested in the determination of a live stick, the determination of life became a differentiated essence while it was the same jewel, and manifested in the latter image. Thus, the change happened in the determination. **And the swallowing in one mouthful its likes from life from the state that it was a live snake, and the things that were sticks from the state that it was a stick.** Thus, considering that the snake is alive, it swallowed all its equivalents in life, and equally, the stick swallowed all that were sticks, considering that it was a stick. Thus, that which manifested in the image of sticks, manifested in essence as the image of the snake, and swallowed up the snakes due to the fact that it was a snake, and the stick swallowed things because in origin it was a stick. Consequently, whatever thing the people of Pharaoh held with and manifested, the luminous eminence which was the genera of Moses annihilated that. **And there manifested proof of Moses over the proofs (of the Pharaoh) in the images of sticks, live snakes and ropes.** Thus the proofs of Moses were victorious over and manifest over the imaginary proofs of the Pharaoh, which were in the images of sticks and live snakes and ropes. **And there were for the magicians ropes, but for Moses there was no rope.** That is to say, Moses did not manifest with rope. In the emergence of mankind, magicians are powers of the self which are coloured by the determination of their own passion. It is also the two powers of lust and anger which are deviated or which lean to the special ties of natural and animal spirit, because even though the powers of the spirit of the self, if it enjoys the conditions and modalities of the powers of

anger and lust, it shows the false images dyed in truth and brings into imagination things which do not have a reality. Rope is a cord, especially a beast's halter, but in usage rope is a thin fibre. Consequently, the Shaykh (R.A.), to point at the value of the magicians in comparison to the value of Moses, says: **And the rope is a small fibre, that is, their value in comparison to the value of Moses is at the same station as a fibre compared to the lofty mountains.** The fact that the magicians appeared with fibres and ropes is allusion to their power in comparison to the power of Moses, where the power of the magicians is comparable to a fibre from very lofty mountains. When the magicians saw this, they knew the degree of Moses in knowledge, and they indeed saw that this was not from within the power of human beings, except from one who has a superiority in the true knowledge, devoid of imagination and conjecture, and they believed in the Lord of the universes, Lord of Moses and Aaron, that is, the Lord to whom Moses and Aaron invited, and they knew that the people of Moses knew that Moses does not invite to the Pharaoh. And as the Pharaoh was in the position of wrongfully assuming to be the judge, and the possessor of the time, and that he is the caliph by the sword, and the enforcer in the customs and legalities, because of all this he said: **'I am your highest Lord'**, and even though they were all Lords comparatively: **'And I am the highest of all of you by what has been given to me in manifestation of judgement over you.'** When the Pharaoh was in the place of judgement as the possessor of the time and was the caliph of God by the sword, and was enforcer in the customs and legalities over the people of Israel, in this case the word 'customs' appertains to the word 'enforcer', that is, even if he were the enforcer in the customs and legalities which is particular to the sultans and leaders, all their actions do not run according to the legal determination, as the Prophet (S.A.) said: **'Obey your leaders even if they go beyond it as if it was oppression.'** However, it is also possible that what is meant by custom and legality is religious legal custom, because legality is Gabriel, and religious custom is related to him because most of the religious predications, perhaps even all of it, results from what he made known. Thirdly, it is also possible that the word 'in the customs' refers to the caliphate, because of which the Pharaoh said: **'I am your highest Lord'**, even though everybody is in some measure a Lord in being able to dispense in their being, meaning: **I am higher than all of the Lords which are manifested among you by virtue of what I have been bestowed of determining over you.** That

is to say, even though all of you are Lords in comparison of what you own and possess, and the lowest form of the Lordship of the earth is Man's own Lordship of himself, yet I am manifest over you with rulership, and to judge an order and determine over you has been bestowed upon me, and as my dispensing in being is more than yours, I am your highest Lord. Now, it is perhaps that 'Lord' is one of the Names of attribution and necessitates that which establishes the Lordship (*marbûb*). In common language it means the possessor or king. One says Lord of the house, Lord of the clothes, Lord of the sheep. It also means the master, as it is said by God in the words of Joseph: 'Return to your master and ask him, why did the women cut their fingers?', and in the case of one of his friends in the prison who used to press wine for his Lord, and other instances like this. And the word 'Lord' without attribution is not attributed to any other than God of the universes. Thus the Lord is the Absolute God, the High One. Consequently, with these three meanings, there results absolute Lordship for Him, and in all images of appearance and example He lords over His servants. For others it is accidental and worldly Lordship, because other is the place of manifestation and revelation of the absolute Lordship. Consequently, the accidental and worldly Lordship is a qualification for the One Essence which manifests in many images. Thus, for whoever is manifest in Lordship, the Lordship for that person is accidental and worldly to the degree that God the High in His possession and in His servants has bestowed upon them a certain degree of dispensation and determination. The places of manifestation of the qualification are varied in degrees and one superior to the other in revelation of Lordship. Consequently, a person whose dispensation and determination is more in comparison to another, his Lordship is higher than the other's Lordship, and sometimes a person is in all the world a caliph in manifestation, and some are, on the other hand, caliphs in the interior. Yet others are caliphs both in the manifestation and interior, like Solomon (S.A.). Thus the Pharaoh, when he was possessor of rulership in his time over his people due to his will being dominant among his people, he was judge, ruler and determiner in comparison with his people, and he addressed them and said to them: 'I am your highest Lord' and attributed his Lordship to them, but he did not say to them: 'I am the highest Lord' or: 'I am the Lord of everything' or: 'I am the Lord of the universes according to absoluteness.' **And when the magicians knew the truth in what he (the Pharaoh) said to them they did not deny**

it, and they affirmed him in this and said to him: 'You decree what is in this life upon earth, so decree what you decree, and the state therein is yours', and his (Pharaoh's) words: 'I am your highest Lord' became true. That is to say, they witnessed the truth in what Pharaoh said because his Lordship was the highest of all the Lordships around him. And they did not deny him, but affirmed him in his degree, and they confirmed what he said, and they said to him: 'What you decree and determine is in the life on this world which is finite and shortly will become cut off, so you decree whatever you decree because the state in this is particular to you', and Pharaoh's words: 'I am your highest Lord' became true in consideration of his accidental and finite Lordship, since he was manifest among his people with the sword and determination. The next phrase is like an answer to a possible question which might say: **And God was the same in the image of the Pharaoh.** This is the answer to the possible question where you might ask: 'You made God the same as all things', in which case it would be true to attribute absolute Lordship to the Lordship which manifested in the place of manifestation of the Pharaoh', but he answers: 'Even though the Pharaoh was the same as the *haqq* in consideration of reality and of unifying, because God was manifest and individuated in him, but the aspect of individuation is for the Pharaoh, and that which is individuated is other than the individuation. Hence the Lordship which is attributed to the image of the Pharaoh is, in comparison to God's Lordship, only an accidental and partial Lordship, not the absolute Lordship.' And he cut off their hands and their feet by God in the image of the false (*bâtîl*). Thus, according to what the magicians said, the Pharaoh acted at once and cut off their hands and feet unjustly, and hanged them, while he was clothed as God in the image of the false. This image of the Pharaoh is ephemeral. Or, God who cut off their hands and feet and hanged them through the Quiddity of God which is manifested and individuated in the false image of Pharaoh. The Shaykh Abu Madyan al-Maghrebi says: 'Do not deny the false in his image because indeed there are certain manifestations of it.'

In the way of (gaining of certain) degrees there is no other way except by such an action. As the Pharaoh was clothed in the sameness with God in the image of falsehood; or, as God was in the false image of Pharaoh, cut off and hanged for the purpose of their attaining to the degrees of the other world of those hanged and killed, such a degree which cannot be attained except by this action. Thus, like God the

High killed the children of Israel in the appearances of the people of the Pharaoh so that their life and succour may appertain to Moses, in the same way He killed the magicians in the image of Pharaoh so that they rise to the degrees of witnesses in the other world, which degree they would not have attained to except if the Pharaoh had killed them through oppression through the necessities of the manifest. Grammatically, the word '*linayl*' might apply to the words of the magicians when they said 'decree', because with the knowledge they had they knew that the hanging and torturing by Pharaoh would lead them to reach the Divine degrees in the other world which they could not attain without that torture and killing, because nobody reaches the degree of witnessing as a martyr except by being killed through oppression. **Because in fact for the causes there is no way of suspending them.** Thus, because in fact there is no way of suspending the causes; since God has caused the reaching of some of the high Divine stations and other-worldly degrees dependent on certain causes, there is no way of suspending those causes so that the reaching of those degrees be possible without those causes and those causes be suspended. **Because in fact the established potentialities (*a'yân-i-thâbita*) necessitated these.** In other words, the established potentialities have necessitated these causes, as the states of the *a'yân* and their determinations and their effects are manifest through causes. **Nothing manifests in existence except in the image according to which establishment a thing is,** as there is no changing in the words of God, and when the words of God referred to the potentialities of existence, the causes are of old from the time when they were established, and they are related to latter things from the point of view of their existence and manifestation, (meaning their manifesting in their individuation, as the *a'yân* never manifest). In other words, the established potentialities never manifest in existence except through the images in which they were present in their establishment, because there is no change in the words of God, and the established potentialities and the realities of knowledge are Divine words. However, the words of the essences are nothing other than the existence, because the established potentialities are manifest in existence through the images of existence. Consequently, the *a'yân*, the essences and potentialities, are considered as ancient in relation to the existence because of their establishment in the Divine Knowledge. Thus, they are called words of the unknown. They are also referred to as latter in relationship to the others by virtue of their manifestation

and existence. In other words, due to the manifestation of the established potentialities and essences in the individuation and relationship of the images of existence. Thus, these latter are called words of existence. Like one says, a man came about to us today, or a guest, and it is not necessary that he had no existence before he happened to come about, because he has come about today. In the same way, God the High, in His dear words, says, as He gives with all the ancientness of His words: 'When I give them something that would remind them of their Lord anew, they insist on not hearing it, and they play, and when I give them something to remind them of the *rahmân* anew, they are of those who turn away', and *rahmah* (that is to say, the Quran) does not come except with *rahmah*. You might say that somebody, or a guest, happened to be with us today, but this does not mean that before he happened to be there today that he did not exist. Thus, a latter happening (*hudûth*) is a relative order and does not necessitate the inexistence of the person before that latter happening. Rather, it necessitates his pre-existence, because had he not existed before, he could not have happened to be there. Because of this, God the High in His dear words, that is to say, concerning what He gives of His most ancient words: 'When I give them something that would remind them of their Lord anew . . .'

However, the most ancient words (the Quran) are Divine and Essential Qualities and Lordly meanings and realities and breaths of the *rahmân*, and in the Essential Uniqueness the same as the *haqq* Himself, and when they are qualified with the Ancientness of God Himself, yet in its manifestation in words and letters, and at the level of its descent to the prophets and the peoples, God the High has qualified it with latterness, and again the *rahmân* which is latterly given by the *rahmân*, which is the Quran, does not come down except through *rahmah*, because it comes down from the *rahmân*, and nothing other than *rahmân* comes down from the *rahmân*, like God says: 'We brought down with the Quran that which is cure and *rahmah*.' And he who turns away from *rahmah* turns towards pain, which is lack of *rahmah*. Thus the Shaykh, having given the determinations and mysteries, the acts which have descended concerning the Pharaoh, turns to the completion of his exposition concerning the belief of the Pharaoh which is the main subject of his words. And His words: 'How can their belief be of any benefit to them when they have seen the calamity? It is the manner of God that pervades among His servants', except for the people of Jonas, does not denote by this that it does not benefit them in

the other world by His words of exemption, except the people of Jonas, which means that the belief of the Pharaoh is belief of despair, and the belief of despair is of no use according to what you say, for which you take as example the people of Jonas. But God's words which we have quoted do not indicate that at the level of peoples' vision concerning the removal of pain of this world for which that belief is of no avail, that belief would equally be of no avail to them in the other world, because of the words 'except the people of Jonas' being taken as an indication, because when the people of Jonas saw the pain and became believers, at that instant God removed from them the shameful pain in this world, as God says: 'Except the people of Jonas, when they believed, We uncovered from them the shameful punishment in the life of this world.' Consequently, that your belief will not be of avail to you at the level of vision of pain for a person who believes at that moment, cannot be taken as an absolute impossibility that their belief will not be accepted from them in the other world. **He wills by this that in this world the taking away is not removed from them. In accordance with this, the Pharaoh was taken away from it together with the presence of belief.** Thus God, with these words, has willed that in fact belief at the sight of pain does not remove from people the taking away and the pain. Thus, other than the people of Jonas, according to the manner of God, it is not taken away from any one person at the level of the sight of pain, calamity; that is why the Pharaoh was taken away from this world with the existence of belief. Consequently, the removal of the pain which is brought down in this world concerning the belief at the sight of pain being of no avail, does not necessitate that the belief would be of no avail in the other world. **This was his order, the order for those who are certain of passing away at that certain hour.** That is, the fact that Pharaoh was taken with the existence of belief is as if the order of the person who is sure of passing away at that very hour is the same as the order concerning Pharaoh. That is to say, the Pharaoh was taken away as he was certain of passing over and in belief. However, even under the consideration of not being certain, one can be taken away with belief in another manner. **The meaning of this situation bestows that he may not have been certain of passing away, because he saw the believers walking in the dried-out road which became evident when Moses hit the sea with his stick, and the Pharaoh was not certain of destruction, like those who are other than at the point of death so that they do not expect to be touched by it.** That is to say, deducing from the

state bestows that in fact the Pharaoh was not in certainty of passing over, because in fact he had seen the believers walking on the dry road, a road which had appeared from Moses' hitting the sea with his stick. Consequently Pharaoh was not certain of destruction at the moment he became a believer. Perhaps rather that he was certain of salvation. The state of the person at the point of death is contrary to this state. The one who is at the point of death at the level of his belief is sure of reaching the destruction. And he believed in that the *bani* Israel believed, when he was certain of salvation, not certain of destruction, and it was like he was certain but not in the same way as he had willed. God saved him from the pain and punishment of the other world in his self and saved his body, like the High said: 'Today We will save your body so that it is an act of proof for your successors.' Thus, like the Pharaoh was certain of, he was saved, but the salvation happened in another way than the way in which the Pharaoh had willed it to happen. Thus the High God gave salvation from pain and punishment in the other world for his self, but also saved his body in this world. What the Pharaoh had willed was the salvation of his body and spirit. However, the salvation of his body and spirit happened in a different way, because God the High gave salvation from punishment to his spirit in the other world, but gave salvation to the body by washing it up on the shore. In fact, God the High said: 'Today We save your body so that it is an act of proof for those who are your successors', which means: today We give you salvation with your body by bringing it to the shore, and today We save your spirit from your body, or We save it from punishment in the hereafter, so that for the people who succeed you, you become a great act of proof to My power. Thus, 'Today We shall save you' is a promise from God the High, or at least an announcement that he will be saved, and God's promise is truth and His announcement is faithful. Because in fact if he were lost with his image (that is, with his body) it might have been that his people would have said: 'He is veiled.' Because in fact had the Pharaoh been lost with his body, his people who believed he was God would perhaps have said the Pharaoh was not drowned but was veiled from the vision of the people, or they might say he has been taken up to the heavens, or is lost from our sight in some other manner. As he was visible in his known image, it was known that he was dead. In fact, his being saved was general in the senses and in the meaning due to his certainty in belief, because from the address: 'We shall save you', if the totality is

intended it is clear, but if the intention is the spirit then it would come to mean: We shall save your spirit together with your body. Those for whom is veridic the word of punishment in the other world, they are those who do not believe, even if all the acts (of God) were brought to them, until they see the painful punishment. They taste the punishment in the other world. That is to say, that person is according to mischief due to his aptitude in the Divine Knowledge and who therefore is under the determination of punishment and is not a believer in the first writing down; that person will not believe, even if all the Divine acts and prophetic miracles were brought to him, unless they taste the painful punishment. That is to say, those who are taken as being the coverers-up of truth and transported to the other world, they will not believe unless they taste of punishment, like Abu Jahl and those of his kind, because when Abu Jahl was killed, he said to the man who killed him: 'Tell your master (that is to say, Mchammed): "Let it be known to you in this state (where I am) that I do not regret opposing you."' **The Pharaoh is outside this class.** Thus, the Pharaoh falls outside the class of the people who deserve the punishment in the other world, because he fully believed.

The Shaykh (R.A.) in this place declares his conviction according to obvious necessities in accordance with the Quranic sayings which came down concerning the Pharaoh's belief, and in this matter the Shaykh has no doubt. However, some have said that he was speaking decidedly upon conjecture, trying to form a legal (religious) opinion, but he is none of those, because trying to form a legal opinion and to speak decidedly upon conjecture is for the rank of the people of doubt who decide upon the most suitable conjecture, whereas the Shaykh (R.A.) is a complete heir. He sees the orders as they are and witnesses them and is in cognizance of them, and he is not in the degree of doubt so that he would furnish definitive Divine proofs for his prevalent doubt, and that he should determine in an order with effective and convincing conjecture. The complete gnostic who is realized with Divine knowledge and the knowledge of the Envoy and acts accordingly, his heart is the source of Divine knowledge and the treasury of Lordly mysteries, and his assertions are not due to his doubt so that he brings irrefutable Quranic proofs, or through irrefutable proof tries to form an effective opinion through conjecture. It is rather that the gnostic heirs bring the irrefutable proofs as images to make those people who look towards Divine proofs and who are people of belief conditioned

by the apparent religious law, understand the true meaning, so that they reach the meaning of an order by way of proofs. However, they do not bring these proofs for themselves so as to obtain knowledge, but they say if the form of the affirmation is in the image of verifying through proofs, then the people of beliefs form a true opinion on it, because they look for such things. Thus, concerning this matter of the Pharaoh, some of the commentators, for the purpose of saving those who are in erroneous doubt concerning the Caliph of God, and through their mercy concerning their offence and criticism and censure in the presence of the Shaykh who is the owner of this book and who is the Caliph of God and heir of the Envoy, they interpreted and changed this part and took it out of the intention of the Shaykh, and some of them said the Shaykh is doubtful on this matter, he is not decisive and binding upon conjecture. It is true he is not upon conjecture, but the lack of conjecture is not in the way that that man would think. There are some who say also that as the Shaykh is of the Sunni sect of the Maliki, he tries to form a legal religious opinion, and some have even said that he was drunk, and some have said he is an appointee, therefore he is excusable. Each one of them reached the solution and answer that his lack of degree necessitated, but all these words are no different in any way from those who deny the degree of the Shaykh with God, and his place of proximity, unless such words were brought about so that people would not fall into the error of denying the Caliph of God in the manner mentioned, and to prevent the offenders from misbelief, to forbid and chase them out from blaming the pure servants of God and eating the flesh of the brothers of God, because the degree of someone who has traversed all the Divine and immanential degrees and who is realized in the heritage of Mohammed by knowledge and state, and who is in possession and in witnessing of the Presence of Divine Knowledge and manifested with the Divine character and creation, he is beyond the possibility of being indecisive, or decisively binding upon conjecture through dominion of doubt, because that person's heart is the place of understanding of the Divine knowledge and the limit of the knowledge of revelation and proving, and he is far removed from forming a legal religious opinion according to the support by imitating a sect. His degree is much higher than that. Furthermore, the words of the complete heir and the completed Caliph are not according to drunkenness, because drunkenness is not suitable for leadership, nor is it allowable for the caliphate, because the Caliph

is a guide and drunkards are not guides. The Caliph is manifested according to the Divine image and is not under the dominion of a state. The words that emanate from a Caliph, even though they are contrary in comparison to the common understanding, are in accordance with the words of absolute certainty (*yaqîn*) and witnessing (*shuhûd*). To relate such things to drunkenness is words of drunkenness and are not the words of a witnessing gnostic. And to say the appointee is excusable is absolute error, because the believer from the Presence of God and the appointee from the Presence of the Envoy of God would have to be appointed through the surrounds of a forbidden order so that his manifesting with the forbidden order would be excusable, and the person of holiness and preciousness and mightiness is far higher than ordering something with an error and a denial. It is true that somebody who has evolved through the Mohammedian religion and who has belonged to any one of the four sects of the Sunni ways and who has flourished in it according to the realities of the Quran and the purified Mohammedian religion which the Prophet established and was present over it, he continues to be a servant according to that special manner, but a person who with essential receptivity and total subjugation and submitting to the Envoy (S.A.) who is the limit and source of all ways, forms, legalities of all religions and manners, which is the place of manifestation of the Mohammedian Divine religion and source of Divine knowledge, and who knows the orders as they are and witnesses the attributes and Qualities according to their order, and is a gnostic, is manifest with such a Mohammedian legality that the Envoy (S.A.) becomes visible to him in his own time, which is both affirmed by Divine inspiration and religious law and is not affirmed through legal religious opinion, because in the company and presence of the Envoy (S.A.), religious opinion is forbidden. There is no possibility of variance of opinion, because at his level what is affirmed is through Divine inspiration. Now let us know like this, that the Shaykh Muhyiddin 'Arabi (R.A.) is the Seal of Mohammedian Sainthood and the possessor of all the Divine degrees, and he is the place of manifestation of the Mohammedian Spirit and the root and source of the Most Holy Effusion of Uniqueness. He is manifestly and interiorly subject to the Envoy (S.A.) through knowledge, and collects in himself all his knowledges and gnosés. He is one of the beauties from among the beauties of the Lord of the envoys, and an evident act of Mohammedian private sainthood. He is aggrandized with the Divine caliphate

and he is rendered most great and honourable with the great Polehood. His existence is a copy of the Knowledge of the *subhân*, the Most Praiseworthy One, and his self is the Divine and Quranic Book. All his words are in accordance with taste and gnosis and witnessing and certainty. Each of his words is an absolute clarity, and each of his words is a true evidence. The words that emanate from him by virtue of his servanthood are words of Divine order and descend through the Lordly Will, and from the aspect of his caliphate all the knowledge and mysteries that manifest from him happen through the Mohammedian allusion. From the point of view of the totality of his being the place of manifestation, all the mysteries of unifying and knowledge of singularizing and separation that he brings down is brought down with the Divine Essential Love and the Godly Will of Eternal Knowledge. Thus this book of majestic power exposes the seals of the knowledge and mysteries which appertain to the private Mohammedian sainthood of the most complete ones of the prophets. He who is the orientation (*qiblah*) of being and the possessor of insight (*kashf*) and of witnessing did not express neither more nor less one letter from what the Envoy (S.A.) appointed as limit to him in his own presence to the Shaykh in his veridic dream (*mubashshirah*) for this book of Divine Knowledge and the container of the knowledge and tastes of the Prophet. He did not determine of his own self, but brought it down with the Divine approbation and the Divine order and the order of the Envoy, through the suggestion to his mind by the One Whose Praises are Forever Sung. In fact, he said at the beginning of this book: 'And I did not suggest except what was suggested to me in these lines other than what it was brought with to me.' Thus, anything that is expressed in this of the Divine Knowledge or Lordly mysteries, whether they are affirmed and acquiesced at the level of understanding or whether they be opposed and denied, it refers back to the Envoy (S.A.). Now let it be known like this, that the belief of the Pharaoh is not of the most important orders and hidden mysteries so that it became necessary for the Shaykh to explain it. For a person who does not bring into his mind even to the amount of one breath anything other than the Presence and the attentive and pious meditation of God, it is impossible for him to condescend to witness of his own accord to the belief of the Pharaoh who is accused with the contention of Lordship. To attribute such an action to such a man is abandon of good form and is an order of evil consequence. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) brought into evidence the belief

of the Pharaoh according to the line and the limit of the Envoy (S.A.), and the Envoy (S.A.) is Mercy and Compassion to the universes and he manifested the belief of the Pharaoh through the most complete place of manifestation of his heir, because God the High, with His words: 'Today We save your body so that it becomes an act for those who come after you', made it one of the acts of His universal Compassion, so that the servants of God who are people of affliction are not saddened until the Day of Judgement from the Divine Spirit. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) says the belief of the Pharaoh is not a belief of sadness (of the last minute), because when he was at the moment of being transferred he was already a believer. Thus he was taken with the presence of belief in him. And all the words that the Shaykh (R.A.) says concerning the Pharaoh are according to veracity and not according to supposition or doubt and hesitation, and it is given according to the manifest meaning of the Quran. It is not according to the realities and interiorities of the Quran so that there be cause for excusing those who deny or blame. How can they who do not believe in what the Quran manifestly gives, rise up to understanding what is interior? Further, this is clearly legally ascertained in the order of individuals trying to form a (religious) legal opinion (*ijtihād*). To endeavour proof of covering up the truth (*kufr*) of a person without absolute proof is not a permissible religious legal endeavour to form an opinion. For those who are people of good taste and witnessing and insight and being, the usage of good form prefers acquiescence, especially that the Shaykh (R.A.) in his *Futūḥāt* in chapter 198 says that God the High acquiesced to Pharaoh in his belief and witnessed his believing. He said: 'God indeed corroborated the Pharaoh in his belief by saying: "Only now, and you had rebelled before", and proved his being saved in his belief. Had he not been of the saved, the High would have said in this matter like He said in the case of the Arabs. He said: "The Arabs believed, but they do not believe, but perhaps they say they have reached fiding (in God) but the belief has not entered into their hearts"', and goes on to explain the details of it. And it is not necessary that although the Pharaoh was taken with the existence of belief in him that he should not be inflicted with fire. At the level of the existence of the qualities of selfhood and human character, when the believer is taken it is necessary that he should be inflicted with fire and cleansed. **This here is the manifest which has come with the Quran.** That is to say, the above-mentioned aspects is this manifested order with which the Quran

arrived, and it is not allocated (asylumed, hidden) in the interior so that its understanding would be made difficult for those of lower understanding. The people of reasoning and comprehension understand this. **And after this we say the order in this matter** (refers) to God, as the generality of the people of the creation stay with his (the Pharaoh's) lack of grace (and perdition), **but they have no certainty in this matter upon which they rely.** It is not the intention of the Shaykh (R.A.) to refer this matter of the Pharaoh's belief to God because the majority of people remain determined that the Pharaoh is an evil-doer who had not come to belief. On the contrary, he makes it very clear that those who still think the Pharaoh is an unbeliever is without any foundation, having established with certainty from Quranic information that the Pharaoh's belief was acceptable to God. For those who still maintain the Pharaoh's known belief being acceptable to God, there is no proof, whereas in what the Shaykh (R.A.) says there is proof, therefore there is no possibility of hesitation in this subject. Perhaps it is rather that the Shaykh (R.A.) having explained the belief of the Pharaoh through the Quran, there still is in the generality of the Jews and Christians and majority of Muslims from among the people a certainty that the Pharaoh is forever an evil-doer, so to remove this matter from such an opposition he says: 'We leave the order in this to God.' And the Shaykh, in accordance with God saying: 'Distribute from what We have brought to you among those who come after in concordance with the Divine order and in respecting the Divine good form', transcends this matter from all orders, and like all the knowledge of realities of everything is attributed to God the High, he equally leaves the gnosis of the order of the Pharaoh to God the High. There is also a pointer in these words to the fact that according to the apparent proofs and clear Quranic expositions, when a believing person is taken, he is apparently taken within belief and it is determined like this. However, as belief is an order of the Essence, nobody except God can know in what manner a person was taken and in what manner was established the belief in the heart of that person. Further, the Shaykh equally points at a pleasantry, that the order concerning the Pharaoh belongs to God, and what believer is there whose order does not belong to God? In short, such a saying as above does not cause hesitation, especially when the Envoy (S.A.) has said to him: 'Say: This is my way. Invite them to God with discerning vision (*baṣīrah*), me and all who follow me.' Thus, the invitation of the Envoy and the

invitation of the complete heirs who follow him in all his states manifestly or interiorly, their words are according to the discerning vision (*baṣīrah*). Consequently, these words emanate from the Shaykh according to discerning vision concerning the absolute certainty of the belief of Pharaoh and lack of any certainty concerning his non-belief. Therefore he leaves the order to God. But concerning his (Pharaoh's) people there is a different determination, but this is not the place for it. 'When the Hour comes, the people of Pharaoh enter into the strongest pain and punishment.' This Quranic act concerns the people of the Pharaoh, not himself. They did not enter the belief and they did not say: 'I have belief in that in which the sons of Israel believe, and I am of the muslims.' They, on the other hand, persisted in believing in the partial Lordship of the Pharaoh and believed in the relative Lord, and they bound and limited and conditioned the Quid-dity of the Absolute Lord, and thereby they became misbelievers. 'On the Day of Judgement they are of the blameable' is also established for the sinful and ungodly from among the believers even though their belief is true. After this, also know that God does not take anyone who is dying unless he is a believer which is attested by what has come down as Divine information. That is, God does not take anyone who is dying unless he is a believer who has attested to the Divine information which has come down through the tongues of the prophets, and it is because of this that sudden death and being killed unknowingly is held as detestable, because such a person is not on the point of death and certain of being transferred, because a person who is dying and is certain of being transferred witnesses the state of the hereafter. And the sudden death is limited to that where the interior breath goes out and no outside breath comes in. This is the sudden death, and this is other than the one who is on the point of death, because this person who meets with sudden death is not aware of his being transferred, whereas the person who is on the point of death is aware. And the man who dies without knowledge is in the same way. His neck is hit from behind his back and he was not aware, and he is taken in whatever way he was of belief or denial, and it is because of this that the Envoy (S.A.) said: 'People are gathered (the Day of Judgement) according to the way in which they were taken, whichever way that may be.' Consequently, the people who die suddenly and the person who is killed without his knowing, he is taken in whatever way he happens to be, in belief or in denial, without knowledge of his being transferred. And there is no one

who is at the point of death who is not a person of witnessing, and he is a person of belief, and he is not taken except in accordance with what he is upon. Thus, a person on the point of death is a person who has witnessing, that is to say, he has knowledge of his being transferred and is in witness of this fact, and he believes, that is to say, he agrees to what he sees and witnesses in the isthmus the states and the dangers and fears of what he witnesses. Consequently, he is taken according to where he exists. Because in fact *kâna* is a letter of being and does not lead to (a sense of) time except by the inference of the state, which means there is no indication of time except what can be deduced from the state, like it is said: 'God was the Knower and the Wise.' Thus *kâna* denotes absolute time, not an indicated time, except through deduction or inference of the states, like in the case of saying: 'Zayd was a rich man', meaning that he was rich in the past and now he is poor, thereby indicating a definite time through what one infers from the state he is in. And one differentiates between the denier who is at the point of death and the denier who is killed without his knowledge and the one who dies suddenly, like we explained when we talked of sudden death. That is to say, the people who are veiled, who are deniers and associators (*mushrik*) before dying, at the point of death witness the angels and the states and fears, and they become believers and acquiesce under the determination of the things they observe. Therefore one differentiates between the deniers and the deniers who die suddenly and who are killed without their knowledge, because the person who is at the point of death has certainty, and in that state he asserts the truth, whereas the others are not like that, unless of course, as it might be rarely the case, he was at that time thinking of God and died suddenly or was killed.

Now let it be known like this, that this belief is according to several aspects. One of them is that the denier becomes a believer when he is not yet in certainty of being transferred. His belief is agreed by all to be acceptable, and where the Shaykh is concerned Pharaoh's belief is of this kind, and because of this belief the believer is benefited in this and the other world. Another aspect is the belief of the person who is certain of destruction, seeing the pain, and is in sorrow and sure of being transferred. This is according to three categories. First, one category of these is the one who benefits both in this world and the other, like the people of Jonas. Another is where the belief does not remove the pain in this world but the belief is acceptable and he benefits in the

other world, because the belief happens during the life in this world, before the death-rattle and the point of death. There is a third category where if he is at the point of death before the sight of the people, even if he was not in the sight of the people at that time and he was at the point of death a believer, this is where there is a difference of opinion. For certain people his belief is acceptable because the Envoy (S.A.) said people are brought to judgement according to the way they died, just as they are taken according to the way they were. Consequently, in concordance with this, that man became certain of transference and witnessed the state of the other world and the angels and became a believer and was taken in consequence of word of belief. Consequently, his last breath was sea'ed with belief and the word of God: 'He who in his last words says: "There is no God but God" enters paradise.' But by another peoples this is not acceptable, because a state of death-rattle is the universe of the isthmus and is cut off from the life in this world which is the place of belief. Consequently, his belief is not acceptable. And this person brings as support the High God's words: 'The day when your Lord shows some of His acts, the belief of a person does not benefit him had he not believed before or gathered good in his belief.' However, this verset is a threat, and the threat is extended from a promise, and it is not a certain proof of lack of benefit or advantage to the belief of a man when at the point of death a person seals his life with the word of belief. Thus, in this case there is a latter connection which is that a believer comes to complete belief with his heart, and when he is saying his belief to himself he thinks in his mind of the other world, and if he is taken at that moment with that memory in his heart, consequently the first instance is preferable, because if at the point of death, though he is a believer, in his mind occurs the other world and he is taken at that moment, this is a difficult order and the order of that is in God's hands. However, in any case, there is a difference between him and the denier that dies either suddenly or is killed without his knowing and there not being a previous knowledge of death, because the person who is killed without his knowledge or is dead suddenly, he is taken in whatever state he happened to be in at that moment. Consequently, there is a different determination for the man who has given up his denial and has come to belief and has spoken the word of witnessing, or equally, while he is saying it, that memory comes into his mind and he is killed or died suddenly, as compared with the other man for whom there is another

determination, who is standing on his denial and that he is killed or that he dies suddenly. Now let it be known like this to you, that you should not draw pride from the aspects of belief like that of the Pharaoh or the ones mentioned above. You should instead, while you exist in this worldly life, strive to eradicate the qualities of selfhood in your being and dethroning the human and bodily characters, and endeavour to be qualified with and acquire the nature of Divine Qualifications and the Mohammedian and Quranic natures, and try your utmost that the Divine collective image and the Mohammedian completion of perfection should manifest in you, and that you should not be satisfied with the lowest degree of belief, which is the belief of the general public, and relinquish your aspiration to the highest degree of belief which is the belief of *kashf* and witnessing, so that at the time of transference you should be transferred with the discerning vision (*baṣīrah*) and quietude, with a heart entirely in peace through perfection (*salīm*), renouncing all things save love for God. 'The day when possessions or children do not benefit except that which God has given through a heart in peace of perfection.'

As to the wisdom of revelation and speech in the image of the fire, because in fact that was the desire of Moses, and He revealed Himself to him in what he required so that he was receptive to it and would not turn away from it, because in fact if He had revealed Himself to him in an image other than what he required, he would have turned away from it because of the concentration of his endeavour to the thing he specially required. If he had turned away because of his concern for his action, God would have turned away from him, but he was purified and brought close, and he who is brought close to Him, He reveals Himself to him in (the form of) his request, and he does not know.

Moses saw Him as fire, the same as what he needed,
But He was the Divinity though he did not know.

That is to say, that God appeared to him in the form of the fire and spoke to him from the fire resides in the wisdom that because Moses was looking for fire, God the High revealed Himself to Moses in the form of what he required through the perfection of His *rahmah*, so that he would not turn away from it but turn towards God. Had God revealed Himself to him in another image other than what he required, Moses would have turned away from God because his endeavour was concentrated on his requirement. Had Moses turned away from God,

surely he would have been returned to his action and work. Thus God would have turned away from him. It comes in a *ḥadīth* (saying of the Prophet): 'He who turns to God totally, God turns to him totally, and he who turns away from God totally, God turns away from him totally.' However, Moses was purified, brought close and selected. Thus, it is because of God's closeness to him that He revealed Himself to him in the image of what he required, even though Moses had no awareness of this. Thus, the revelation of God to Moses in the image of fire is the result of God's friendship to Moses, so that he would not turn away from Him if He appeared to him in an image other than what he required.

Now, you know it like this, that indeed Moses (S.A.) was purified and beloved and that God attracted him to Himself through giving him friendship and help through his converse with Jethro (Shu'ayb) (S.A.) so that Jethro would describe to him God and make Moses love Him. What was predominant in Moses was that he required vision, and vision cannot happen except in the form of an image, and fire is the most honoured image in the universe because fire is related to God through two very grand (great) Qualities which are Destruction (*qahr*) and Love (*muḥabbah*), because in the burning by fire the effect of destruction is manifest, because fire does not touch anything where that thing does not receive its effect, and definitely fire annihilates everything. In fact God does not reveal Himself to anything where that thing is not annihilated. There is no revelation except by the reception of that which has been revealed to. Light is the effect of Love because Light by its essence is beloved. Consequently, it is from the perfection and completion of God's bounty to Moses that He made him go out looking for fire, so that he attaches his whole endeavour to fire and turned to it totally. Thus He revealed Himself to Moses in the image of fire. Consequently, his exterior and interior was covered through the revelation in the image of fire with the two Qualities of Annihilation and Love from fire by which the revelation was made. It is without a doubt necessary for the thing through which the revelation is made that it should be qualified by the Qualities of the revealer and be suitable to the thing upon which it is revealed. This is the third witnessing which happens before the station of Union (*jam'*) in separation and in the station of converse which necessitates duality. However, the real witnessing in the meaning necessitates the annihilation of that which is revealed to in the revealer. 'When his Lord revealed Himself to the

mountains they flattened, and Moses rolled down in a faint' (Quran). In this case there is no duality, and there is no address or speech except after being annihilated and coming round and becoming existent and remaining (*bâqi*) with the Being of God. God leads whom He pleases to the straight path.



Of the Wisdom of Intention and Refuge (*al-ḥikmat as-ṣamadiyyah*) in the Word of Khalid

THE Wisdom of Khalid bin Sinan is that he indeed by his invitation manifested the prophethood of isthmuseity (*barzakhiyya*). That is to say, after his death and then having come back to this life, he wanted to invite through the prophecy of the *barzakhiyya* consequent to witnessing. This is what one must remember, that he did not profess to give news of the states of the other world except after his death. That is to say, it was not that Khalid was manifested with the prophecy of *barzakhiyya*, but that he would first die and would witness the states of the *barzakh* and then, after becoming alive again by Divine order, he would be manifested with the prophecy of *barzakhiyya*. That is why Mohammed did not consider Khalid's prophethood when he said: 'I am the first man (prophet) after Jesus, son of Mary, and he (Khalid) was between me and him, a prophet.' Now let it be known like this, that Khalid bin Sinan was between Jesus and Mohammed and closer to the appointment (*ba'th*) of Mohammed, and he lived in the lands of Aden. When Khalid realized the completeness of Mohammed and that the 'Mercy to the universes' (*rahmah lil-'âlamîn*) was appointed, he wished that what he gave out, his prophecy, would result in being universal, and he wanted his prophethood to be dependent on that knowledge which results from what is in the *barzakh* for the totality of creatures after death. Because the people in general do not concord with what is given out as prophecy from a person as they would concord with what he would give out of what he had actually seen and witnessed in the *barzakh* after his death and his coming to life again, since the prophecy of such a prophet would be more eloquent in effect upon the beliefs of the people.

Khalid was very strong in *himmah*, and the witnessing of the Singularity (*aḥadiyyah*) was dominant over him. His people who believed in him always referred to him whenever ill befell them. During his time, in the lands of Aden, a great fire appeared which came out of a cave and destroyed the produce and the agriculture of those lands. And his

people, who believed in him, as usual called upon him for the elimination of this ill so that he could drive away this fire. When Khalid saw the fire he started beating it with his stick from its edges and drove it backwards by dividing it until finally Khalid, beating it back, drove it back into the cave it had come out of. Then he told his children and family and the people who believed in him: 'It is necessary that I go into this cave to extinguish the fire, and you must not call me out or call to me while I am in the cave for three days, because if you call me out or call to me I shall come out of the cave and I will die. If you will be patient I shall come out unscathed.' When Khalid had entered the cave, his people were patient for two days and they did not call him. Then the Satan inspired them and they were not patient for three days, and before the time was completed they shouted and screamed and said: 'Khalid is destroyed.' Upon this, Khalid came out of the cave before the time was up, and because of the sadness and ill that befell him because of their screams, he had his hands over his head and he said to his people: 'You have squandered me, and my words and promises have been squandered', and then he told them of his death and ordered them that after his death they should bury him and they must calculate forty complete days. After the completion of forty days a flock of sheep led by a donkey with its tail cut off would come. When that donkey would come to where his tomb was, he would stop there, then they should dig open his tomb and Khalid would stand again and through his witnessing after his death he would give them news of the true state of affairs, so that the totality of the people hearing this attain to certainty of closeness (*yaqīn*) and that the information given by the prophets would be a reality for them.

Khalid died and passed over to the *barzakh* and they buried him, and they waited by his tomb for forty days, and after forty days they waited for the flock of sheep to come, and as it was told them the flock of sheep did arrive and was preceded by a donkey with its tail cut off, and the donkey did actually stop next to the tomb. His people who believed in him wanted to open Khalid's tomb as he had ordered, so that he could tell them of the truth of the prophets and of their prophet-hoods. The elder ones of his children opposed it and said: 'It would be a great disgrace on us among the Arabs if they dig the tomb of our father, and they will call us the children of the exhumed', and thus they squandered Khalid's will and lost him. Khalid had ordered that he should be exhumed and that he should be questioned and Khalid

would have given them news of the *barzakh* wherein determinations of sorrow and good taste and happiness and rebellion are in the images of life on earth, so that by Khalid's giving news of this, all the envoys' truths would become veridic in that which they said during their life on earth, concerning the things of the other world. Because for the general public, if a prophet dies and comes back, the effect of the news he gives of the other world is more definite than the information of the other world given by a prophet who is not dead but who is alive in this world. Khalid's aim was that the whole of the universe believe in all that the envoys have brought as determinations and laws so that the mercy (*rahmah*) be upon the whole of the universe, because Khalid was honoured by the fact that his prophethood was close to the prophethood of Mohammed, and Khalid knew that Mohammed was being sent as mercy to the universes (*rahmatan lil-'âlamîn*) and because of that he had desired the universal prophethood.

Khalid was not an envoy (*rasûl*) but he wished greatly that the whole of the people benefit from the mercy which was to come through the envoyship of Mohammed, even though he was not appointed with announcement. He had wished that in the *barzakh* he would be given pleasure from that general mercy so that in his knowledge concerning the immanence he should become strengthened, as he was to give news through witnessing of the ways of the *barzakh*. But as has been said, his people squandered him, and it is said that after the appointment of the Envoy Mohammed, a daughter of Khalid came to see him and the Prophet greeted her by saying: 'Greetings, oh daughter of the prophet whose people have squandered him.' The Prophet did not qualify the people of Khalid by being lost, but qualified the prophet of the people as indeed being squandered, because they did not allow him to attain his aim and they did not execute his will, and consequently he was not manifested with the prophecy of *barzakhiyya*.

Does the desire to do something deserve an equal merit even if one is prevented from actually bringing it about? Without doubt or controversy this is definitely so. There is the example of what the Prophet said about the man who had desired to go and pray in the mosque with the congregation but was prevented by the congregation being dispersed so he could not meet up with them. For him, his desert is the same as if he had done his prayer with the congregation. However, in the case of a poor man who wishes to do a good deed like a rich man,

he is unable to execute his intention because of his poverty. The rich man who has the same intention combines the action with the wish, whereas the poor man coincides with the rich only in the wish. Yet the desert of the desiring poor man is the same as that which results for the rich man. The rich combine intention and action, whereas the poor combine wish and intention, and what is obvious here is that for him the desert is not the same in all its phases. That is why the Prophet said for Khalid that he was wasted by his people. Consequently, the prophecy of the *barzakhiyya* did not manifest, and his people did not thereby attain completion through him. Equally Khalid did not manifest with the taste (*dhawq*) of that prophethood and did not manifest it. And with the face mentioned above, he desired manifesting with prophethood, and because of that desire he was gratified by the position of prophet. Nevertheless, the Prophet did not stipulate between the deserts of the wishful poor and the deserts of the intention with the action, and equally did not stipulate between the resultant desert of the intention and of the action, but on the contrary he referred all this to Absoluteness (*iṭlâq*). What is evident from this is that there is no equality between the two deserts of intention and action, or between the desiring poor and the one who has realized faithfully what he intended, and it is because of this question of lack of equality that Khalid bin Sinan desired the prophethood of announcement, so that the station of joining between the orders would become veridic for him and that it would be resultant on both kinds of desert, because had there been equality he would have been satisfied with desiring.

The Wisdom of Singularity
(*al-ḥikmat al-fardiyyah*)
in the Word of Mohammed

INDEED that which he was, the Wisdom of Singularity, is because he was the most complete existent or being in this humankind (genus of humanity), and because of this, order started with him and ended with him, because the reality of the Envoy (Mohammed) and his devolution (*ta'ayyun*) is the collectivity of the totality of the Divine immanential reality, and the being (existence) of his human genus is also devolved in the totality of Ipseital place of manifestation. The *ḥaqq* is apparent in that with total manifestation with His Ipseity and Qualities. In other words, Mohammed, peace be with him, is the first devolution of the Divine devolutions through which becomes devolved the Ipseity of Uniqueness, and it is thereby prior to all devolution. Further, it is the beginning and origin of all devolutions and is inclusive of all devolutions. Further, he is one and singular in being, and has nothing equal to it, because in this degree there is no other equal devolution, because beyond this degree there is no other degree than the Ipseity of Absolute Uniqueness which is transcendent from all devolution and quality and name and image and limit and praise. Further, singularity is specific to him absolutely because of his inclusiveness of all devolution. Ibn 'Arabi calls his Wisdom with the qualification of 'Total Wisdom', and there is no difference between singularity and totality except by consideration, because this first devolution in consideration of other devolutions is the totality of all totals. The devolution of the other *anbiyâ'* are equally total devolutions and they are equally descending devolutions, and when they reach personal devolutions they are various and dissimilar in the degrees. Because of this, the Envoy at the coming of the Day of Judgement said: 'There was the *nabiyy* and with him a small group of people, and there was the *nabiyy* and with him there were two men, and there was the *nabiyy* and with him there was one man, and there was the *nabiyy* and with him there was not any other one.' What results for Mohammed is absolute totality and total reality, and

because of this, for him and his people there came the saying (Quranic): 'And thus We brought you as a middle people so that you be witnesses or examples to people and that the Envoy be singular witness over you.' And then, addressing Mohammed: 'And We did not send you except as Compassion and Mercy to the universes, and We did not send you except to all the people.'

It is without a doubt there is a special relationship of the *ḥaqq* to each one of the devolutions from among devolutions, and that relationship is a Name from among the Divine Names with the Ipseity, and that person is collected to the High God by that Name of the first devolution and that Name educates that person, and this is why the Biggest Name (*ism-i-â'zam*) does not happen except for our *nabiyy*, who is evolved with that Name and that Name is manifest with him and this Name is special to him and it is not made special to any other *nabiyy* from among the *anbiyâ'*. Thus the devolutions of the unknown and of witnessing in their totality include the totality of his devolution, and because the *ḥaqq* manifests in his being with total manifestation, because it is the most complete thereby perfect being, and consequently his Wisdom becomes the Wisdom of Singularity. Because the order of being and the order of *nabiyy*ship begins with him, Ibn 'Arabi implies the coming of the *nabiyy* by declaring the *ḥadîth*: 'I was a *nabiyy* and Adam was between water and clay.' Then, through the emergence of the human genus, he became the last (seal) of the *anbiyâ'*, and thus declares with these words that the order of *nabiyy*ship ends with him. Now let it be known like this, that the Divine Reality of Mohammed, according to which Adam was created, does not eliminate it from being ever present in the Divine place of manifestation in all the Divine Presences, just like the Presence of the 'ama of Compassion of the *nafs* (of the Ipseity) and like the Presence of the light of the Names of Knowledge and in the place of manifestation of the Name *mudabbir* in the degree of the Prime Intellect, from the being of which and consequent to its manifestation the spiritual universes included in the totality of specialities of orders which became the total spirit, which having been delegated to the human and possessional spirits together with the totality of the uniqueness of the Divine specialization became a *nabiyy*, just as he pointed to it with the words: 'First God created my light.' The High God collected in this light of Mohammed the totality of the lights of *anbiyâ'* and *awliyâ'* before chaptering and with this uniqueness of

totality within the being of the *ʿāyn*. After that, when the spirits became evolved in the degree of the Guarded Tablets and each became specialized from the other and each one's reality of light became manifest and they were differentiated one from the other, the High God delegated as *nabiyy* to them the reality of Mohammedian spirituality so that he prophetized to them of the perfection and completion of the reality of singularity of totality, and the words: 'I was a *nabiyy* when Adam was between water and mud' is an indication of this revelation (revealing, sending, rising), and it involves all the revelations in the prior emergences. When the total, high, natural images which are from the Throne and the Chair became existent, and when first the places of manifestation and their completion of the lights which are the caliphs and *awliyâ* of the spirits of the *anbiyâ* became existent, then that mystery of the revelation of Mohammed became manifest to them in the second place. From among the spirits, those who became secure in that are the spirits who are indissolubly joined to the Divine spirituality of the singularity of total perfection of the humankind. In that emergence the High God resided the descendants of Adam in the station of *shuhûd* after having appointed them in the plain of existence. And then He addressed them with the words: 'Am I not your Lord?' (*alastu bi rabbikum*), and they answered: 'Yes, indeed' (*balâ*). When the images of genres became existent, the determination (*ḥukm*) of that belief became manifest among the human beings of perfection. They believed in this, and they are the best of people. The Envoy Mohammed pointed at this mystery: '*Al arwâḥ junûd mujannadah fimâ ta'ârif minhâ i'talif wa mâ tanâkir minhâ ikhtalif.*' And when this emergence of the genus of the perfect perfection of the human perfection became the most complete and the most perfect of the totality of all emergence, and when the totality of Divine manifestation became manifest according to the most perfect way in the emergence of genus of Mohammed, thereby Mohammed becoming the most perfect existent and the totality of the images of existence, consequently the Divine Wisdom, by virtue of being placed in that, became manifest in the most perfect and most total way. Because of this the order of *nabiyy*ship, the order of religion and the order of perfect manifestation became finalized by it, and the Wisdom of Singularity became specialized in that.

And the first of the singularities is three and is not one. Even though one is the origin of number it is not from among numbers,

and two is coupling. Three is the first of singulars because singularity is first one of a pair and singly separate which is one with two is collective and from the collection of two and one singularity became particular to three because of one and two, and three became the first of the singles, and singularity is Ipseity, Divine Will and Word, and in manifestation its existence is the most perfect and total existence, and this singularity is called the Reality of the great Realities and the isthmus of collectivity and the real Adam. And according to this primordality (firstness) which is three, that those which are further of these singularities, like five and seven, they are indeed in this primordality derivatives. The Envoy is the first symbol of and guide to (*dalil*) his Lord, because he is in reality the place of manifestation of primordial singularity which necessitates from the *ḥaqq* the existence of the universe, and the singularity, as has been mentioned, is Ipseity, Will and Word, and the universe in its image of totality is the place of manifestation of this singularity. Consequently, Mohammed collects in his *nafs* all the qualities of perfection existent in the universe which emanate from the Divine singularity. He is the symbol of and guide to his Lord because he is the place of manifestation of the totality of singularity and is derived from the totality of singularities. That is why order began with him, and equally he is the end and the collector in himself of the totality of individuals through his image of total humankind. And to him is given the totality of words (*jawâmi' kalim*), which are what are denoted by the Names of Adam. In fact, by virtue of that collectivity the Envoy was given the collectivity of words which are the words which denote what Adam's Names signify. That is to say, what is denoted by the Divine Names which Adam was made to know through Divine knowledge. And even if the Divine words are by derivation and embranchment infinite, yet their origin is specific to three mothers. The first of these is the Divine existential active *a'yân* and realities. The second is the realities of acted-upon-ness of the possibilities of servanthood (*marbûb*), and the third one is the realities of the totalities of the perfection of the humankind, and all these three are the mothers of the happenings of Ipseity and they are the possessors of the reality of the essential comprehension and transcendence. In short, these words are the totality of words, and these were given to the Envoy and the Envoy collected them by the great isthmuseity. In fact, the Envoy became similar to the symbol in the trinity which is collected in this. In short, the

Envoy became similar to the symbol. In other words, because the Envoy comprised the symbol of conjunction of the smallest and the biggest and the middle limit which comprises the trinity, and by being the symbol which comprises the original and secondary duality and equally of the placing of the original and the elevating of the second which is the trinity, the Envoy became similar to that, because his reality is the place of manifestation of the primal singularity which is the source and exactly the same as the trinity, and by his corporeality being the most total of the existents of humankind he is given the words of the three kinds, which are the words of the Divine activity of necessarily-so-ness and the words of immanential acted-upon-ness of possibilities and the words of the realities of the totalities of human perfection, and his being thus became the totality of the collectivity of these words. In other words, the Envoy came to comprise by virtue of the words the trinity. But because the symbol from one face is other than what it symbolizes, so that there be no possibility of understanding any difference between the Envoy and the Envoy's symbolizing and guidance to the *ḥaqq*, he says the symbol is the symbol of his own *nafs*. In other words, the Envoy, which is the most symbolic of the symbols of the *ḥaqq*, is symbol of and guide to his own self. That is to say, the guidance and symbolism of the Envoy to the *ḥaqq* is essential symbolism because the reality of the Envoy is the *ta'ayyun* of the Absolute Ipseity with the First *ta'ayyun*, and his being equally is the place of manifestation of the Absolute Ipseity, and the Divine Ipseity is therein elevated from it so that no other thing can be symbol to it. In other words, the Envoy's symbolizing of the *ḥaqq* is the *ḥaqq*'s symbolizing to His own Ipseity, because his essential individuality is the same as the *ḥaqq*'s Absolute Ipseity. There is no difference between these two except by consideration of *ta'ayyun*, and by consideration of the *tawḥîd* of the Ipseity, She is She. It is the same *'ayn* and the same *dhât*, and is in the degree of transcendence absolute and in the degree of relativity individualized.

When the reality of Mohammed gave the first singularity it was triangular of emergence, and was garbed with a triangular emergence. Because singularity is Ipseity and Will and Word, and that the Envoy is its image which is the Ipseity and necessarily-so-ness and receptivity, it would consequently be according to the origin of the image which is according to trinity, and thereby by its emergence of genus

it is triangular, spiritual, corporeal and by collectivity of reality. Because the Envoy is of triangular emergence, on the context of love, which is the origin of being, the Envoy said: 'I was made to love three things of your world', and this is because of the happening of trinity in the Envoy. In other words, because the reality of the Envoy gives trinity he said: 'From your world three things were given to me from the *ḥaqq* and were put in my heart.' The rest of this *ḥadīth* is: '... women and nice scents, and the freshness of the eyes was brought to me in prayer.' He mentions women and scents and equally mentions that in his prayer the freshness of his eyes was brought to him. He begins with the women and ends with prayer (*ṣalāt*). At the origin of the appearance of its '*ayn*, woman is a portion of man, just as man is some portions of the manifestation of the *ḥaqq*, and the *ḥaqq* is its origin and source of emergence, and these words are understood without being expressed. That the Envoy mentioned women at the beginning and left the prayer to the last and the explanation of this is this. Indeed woman is a portion of man at the origin of the manifestation of the '*ayn* of the woman because the origin of the manifestation' of the '*ayn* of the woman is Adam. Because Eve is created from a rib of Adam (which equally means a side of a triangle or a segment of a globular figure), consequently she is a portion of him, just as mankind is some manifestation of the *ḥaqq* and the *ḥaqq* is its origin and source of emergence, because indeed God created Adam in His own image.

The relative being of man is the second degree to the Absolute Being of God. The First *ta'ayyun*, which is the reality of Mohammed, is the second degree for the *la ta'ayyun* because it is a relative *ta'ayyun*. In the same way, Prime Intellect and the High Pen, which are the *ta'ayyun* of being for the *ḥaqq*, are second degree. Equally, Total *nafs* is second degree for the Prime Total Intellect and the Guarded Tablets. Eve, equally, is the second degree for Adam. Equally, the being of man is second degree for the Being of *ḥaqq*. It is the chaptering of the first degree, and its descent and appearance. The knowledge of the man of his own *nafs* is the introduction to the knowledge of his Lord, and the knowledge of his Lord is the result of his knowledge of his *nafs*. Just as it is understood from: 'And I blew into him from My own Spirit', the knowledge of its own *nafs* of the man, who is a portion of the Being of the *ḥaqq*, is an introduction to the knowledge of his Lord, because a man's knowledge of his Lord is

resultant from his knowledge of his *nafs*. That is to say, Eve, in relationship to Adam, is for example an introduction to the knowledge of Adam's manhood and his being qualified by the adjectives of activity, because if there was no Eve, Adam could not be manifested with that quality, and equally he would not be realized and qualified with that. Man in relationship to God is like a portion and a branch, and the *haqq* is the total and origin. Man, by his own activity and his acknowledgement of Lordship (servanthood) (*marbûb*), is an introduction to the knowledge of the Lord's quality of action and His Lordship, because he himself and the knowledge of his Lord is resultant from his knowledge of himself. If he does not know that his *nafs* was qualified by the qualities of the receptivity of action and by the quality of acknowledging Lordship (*marbûb*), he cannot know the qualification of the *haqq* by the qualities of action and Lordship. It is more like that the *haqq*'s quality of action and Lordship becomes realized by his being, because man's knowledge of his own self, which is the second degree in the being of the man, it is introduction and origin to the knowledge of God. Thus he said (the Envoy): 'He who knows his *nafs* knows his Lord.' Consequently, if a person knows his *nafs* he will know his Lord, and this makes the knowledge of the *nafs* an introduction to the knowledge of the Lord and makes the guide, and it makes the knowledge of the Lord a result for the knowledge of the self. All this is because in the Being of the *haqq* is the origin, and the servant is subsequent (the branch), and in knowledge the knowledge of the servant is the origin and the knowledge of the Lord is subsequent. Woman is portion for man, and man is the *ta'ayyuns* of some of the degrees of the manifestation of the *haqq*, and each portion symbolizes its origin and guides to it. Woman is symbol and guide to the man. Man is symbol and guide to the *haqq*, and symbol and guide is introductory to that which it symbolizes and guides to. Equally, as the woman is the *nafs* and the *ta'ayyun* of the man, because his own being and *nafs* is closest to it, he (the Envoy) gave priority to the women. According to these considerations, the saying concerning the knowledge of man of his own self begins by the mention of the woman and finalizes at the end by the mention of the prayer as the last. If you want you can speak of forbidding of knowledge and arrival through inability, because it is true indeed that by virtue of reality where it concerns the *haqq* it is allowable to forbid knowledge, or if you want you will speak with the establishment

of knowledge. All this is to say, considering the Absolute Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* cannot be known and man is unable to comprehend and know this because nobody knows God except God Himself, but through the consideration of the Being of the *ḥaqq* in the human *nafs* and Its *ta'ayyun* and Its relativization thereby, *ḥaqq* can be known. The first of these indeed is if you know that you do not know your *nafs*, indeed you do not know your Lord, and the second is, if you do know, then you know your Lord. The first of these is the forbidding of knowledge, which means that if you do not know your *nafs* by virtue of the reality of the *ghaybness* of the *nafs*, then you do not know your Lord. The second is the establishment of knowledge, which is that you know your *nafs* by the perfectional qualifications. Then you will know your Lord because *nafs* is the outward (*zâhir*) of the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and the *ḥaqq* is the *bâtin*. Consequently, from his apparent qualifications and perfections he derives the qualifications and perfections of the *ḥaqq*. Perhaps even that these perfections and qualifications are the perfections and qualifications of the *ḥaqq* which are manifest from the *bâtin* of the *ḥaqq* in the human *nafs* which is its place of manifestation. Mohammed was indeed the most lucid symbol of or guide to his Lord, and indeed every portion of the universe is a guide and symbol to its origin which is its Lord, and understand this. Mohammed by his reality collects in himself all the realities of the universe, and by his body and being the totality of the portions of the universe. That is to say, the First *ta'ayyun*, which is the reality of Mohammed, has in it devolved (*muta'ayyin*) the totality of the Divine and immanential realities and is the beginning and origin of emergence of all realities. The *'ayn* of Mohammed, which is devolved through the First *ta'ayyun* and is the owner of the collectivity of the great isthmuseity, is not distinguished from the Ipseity of Uniqueness except by consideration of *ta'ayyun*. It is the collector of the totality of the realities of Divine Names of necessarily-so-ness and the totality of the realities of immanential places of manifestation of receptivity of action. And the image of the emergence of Mohammed collects in itself the Presence of the Uniqueness of Ipseity, the Presence of Oneness of the Names and the totality of the degrees of possibilities which are the degrees of being after the First Intellect, which are devolved to the end of the human image, and is the best concentration and the result of all degrees. There is not a thing of the Divine Reality in the Divine Presence and equally

in the Presence of possibilities, like spirit, heart, *nafs*, *khayâl* and body, and of the *a'yân* of action and reception of the universe, which is not collected in the image of Mohammedian place of manifestation of the totality of all original portioning and synthesizing. Mohammed then is total symbol and guide (*dalîl*) to his Lord, and the lucid path, because he is the places of manifestation of the Divine perfection, and his guidance and symbolization is again to his own *nafs*. And you, understand this with the subtle understanding.

And when women were made lovable to him, his inclination of affection to them is of the kind of the inclination of the total to the part. This inclination is again to his own *nafs*, because considering the reality of the part being the same as the total even though by another consideration the devolvement (*ta'ayyun*) is not the same, yet a thing never inclines with love to another thing except its own self, and yearning does not happen except to its own self, except, of course, in between them there is the fact that the total is devolved in the part. And this exists between the total and the part, and if there had not been this consideration between the total and the part and there had been no connection between the two, the total would not have been a total and the part would not have been a part, and if the part was not the total, then the total would have no love and inclination towards it. And the Envoy exteriorized from the order of the *nafs* from the closeness of the *haqq* concerning the emergence of this genus and through the meaning of the words: 'And I blew of My own Spirit into them.' That is to say, as the woman is part of the man, the Envoy's inclination and yearning for the female is the inclination and the yearning of the total for the part, manifesting that the love is to the self since the High God had blown of His total Spirit into man, the spirit of man became like a part of the Divine Spirit, just as the *haqq*'s inclination and yearning for the man's emergence and His conditioning (relativization) in the human being is the total's inclination and yearning for its part. Adam witnessed his own self in Eve, and in the second step it is her love for his own self, just like the human being is for the Being of the *haqq* the second degree since the *haqq* devolved in him. Then He qualified His *nafs* with a very strong yearning and desire for the face of man, by virtue of His devolvement in the place of manifestation of man. The *haqq*'s yearning for this becomes His yearning for His own *nafs*, and He said about those who yearn: 'Oh David, My yearning for them is much stronger (more

intense) . . . ' meaning their yearning for Him. And that is the pure face. In other words, God's yearning for them is much more intense than their yearning for the *ḥaqq*. The *ḥaqq*'s yearning for them is the yearning for the private pure face. It may be asked, the *ḥaqq* is in everything present and He witnesses everything, nothing is far from Him, which means He is with them. How is it possible? His yearning for the servant is in what way imaginable? The answer is that the *ḥaqq*'s yearning for those who are yearning is the pure facing of each other which is total *fanâ'*, real death, elimination and taking away of the *ta'ayyun*, wherein He witnesses His own face and face-to-faceness in the most complete and the most perfect fashion, because *ḥaqq* is devolved (*muta'ayyin*) in the being of those who yearn. Consequently, His yearning for them is His yearning for His *nafs*. The *ḥaqq*'s yearning for His own *nafs* in the degrees of relativization is much more intense than in His degrees of transcendence, and this is because of His yearning for His degree of transcendence from His degree of relativization together with the servant, because this is total yearning, and this yearning is partial if it were that it be the *ḥaqq*'s yearning for His own *nafs* from the place of manifestation of Mohammed. Yet however, that also is total yearning and the *ḥaqq*'s yearning for the manifestations of perfections of humanity, which yearning is the pure face-to-faceness and pure witnessing, because the *ḥaqq* witnesses His Ipseity in His own Ipseity. But He observes His Names and Qualifications and their perfections in the place of manifestation of the perfection of man, who were in annihilation in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently it becomes that *ḥaqq*'s yearning for them in their places of manifestation, that yearning for the pure face-to-faceness which happens in their place of manifestation. Indeed, in the *ḥadīth* concerning the *Dajjāl* he said: 'No one of you can see his Lord before death certainly, and before the veil of nature has been removed.' But it is impossible that any person be qualified by total lack of vision of the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, it is necessary that the pure face-to-faceness which happens at the level of the dead servant must be full of joy of yearning so that the *ḥaqq* with the most intense joy of yearning yearns for him. And this which is placed in death is the pure face-to-faceness, whether death be by will or natural. And it is necessary that what is meant by these words is that it is absolutely without a doubt from the point of view of the *ḥaqq*'s yearning for that person who at the level of death reached through

yearning the face of the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, because of his yearning for the face of *ḥaqq*, having taken away from in between them their veil of the body, it is without a doubt that the *ḥaqq* has yearning for that person. And what of the joyful yearning of the *ḥaqq* for those who are the *muqarrabîn*? They see Him with His immanence and they love what they see and they yearn for this station (*maqâm*). The High *ḥaqq*'s yearning is established and is certain for these *muqarrabîn*. When the High *ḥaqq* was witnessing them and they were being witnessed by the *ḥaqq*, it absolutely necessitates that the *muqarrabîn* witness Him without a veil by removing the veil of devolution from among them the devolved *'ayn*, even though the world station and emergence of the genus forbids the witnessing of the *ḥaqq* because of the characters of the nature and the veils of genus necessitated in the body of the human being. Consequently, in total *fanâ'* and the level of the death of will, the qualifications of immanence and the veils of possibilities being removed at this level, or at the level of the removal of the veils through natural death, he observes, if there has not been left any other veil other than the veils of possibilities and other than the veil of the body. But if the qualifications appertaining to mankind and veils of possibilities are established and remaining in his nature, he will not be able to observe even at the level of death. 'He who was of these blinds, he will be blind also in the other world.' And the word of God concerning His Eternal Knowledge, concerning the knowledge and images of all things which are established in this Knowledge, becomes similar to what He said to David about His yearning being more intense (*shadîd*). As God said through the *ḥadîth* of Hesitation and it is of this context: 'I do not hesitate in anything I do as I hesitate in taking the spirit away of My believing servant who is repelled by death, and I find his vexation disagreeable; however, it is unavoidable that he should see My face. In other words, I hesitate because My faithful servant finds death unpleasant and I find his repulsion at death which will bring him to face Me repulsive, so I hesitate to take his life which will bring him to face Me in that state when he is in repulsion. I would not like to take his spirit away in his state of disagreeableness, and that he should with that quality come to Me. I would have preferred that I take him away when he is in a state of yearning, in which case if at that state of yearning I take his life he will certainly join Me, and I like that he joins Me in that state of yearning for Me.' God then has given the

omen of joy to His servant by promising him reaching His pure face-to-faceness, yet He did not say: 'Without a doubt he will die', but He said: 'Without a doubt he shall come face to face with Me', so that He does not sadden His servant by the mention of the inevitability of death. Just as the Envoy said: 'None of you will see the Lord except after death', if nobody joins the *ḥaqq* from His servants except after death, that is why God said: 'Without a doubt he will meet Me face to face', and God's yearning is because of the existence of this relationship. That is to say, the *ḥaqq* is desirous, yearns for the coming face to face of the servant with the *ḥaqq* at the level of the existence of death.

Let it be known like this, that coming face to face which happens after death at the level of the removing of the corporeal veil and being drawn away from the natural preoccupations, with relationship to the people who are veiled but who are confident of the *ghayb* this coming face to face happens for them according to the images of their belief. These images are either manifest in the '*âlam-i-mithâl*', or in the isthmuseities of spiritual light, or in the shapes of the skies and images of the heavens, according to the qualifications of the *nafs* and the strength of the inclination and by virtue of the elimination of degrees it is manifest to them. The Envoy said: 'The spirits of the martyrs are in the offices of green birds and these are heavenly sacred territories', and in another *ḥadîth* he said: 'Among the candles hanging under the Throne and these are self-lit pearly stars', and by comparison with the people of witnessing among those who are absolutely certain, coming face to face with Him is constant. That sort of people who in their life in this world were killed from their devolution and their being and became separated from the clothes of their nature, and they witness the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the fact that they have been divested of their natural and *nafs*al totality and God has brought them to life with a Divine life after death. These became victorious and reached the facing of God according to absoluteness and relativity, and they saw the ever-remaining face of Beauty in the total and are saved from fear and separation. But they have no joy of yearning like the first group who are forever in yearning because the Divine revelation is forever consecutive without ever repeating itself. These observe the *ḥaqq* all the time in one of His revelations and equally are yearning for His light of Beauty in other revelations. Abu Yazid, may God sanctify his mystery, spoke from this station when he said:

'I drank of love, cup after cup. Neither the wine finished nor my thirst.' Also from among the people of belief and people of certainty there is a group of people of the heart who observe the *ḥaqq* in His clothes of Qualifications of Beauty, yet there remains, and these are the people of closeness of supererogatory works. The Envoy points at this in the words of the *ḥadīth qudsi*: 'I am their hearing and their vision.' Having been qualified by the Divine Qualities they are divested of their human qualities, yet not being annihilated from their ipseities they are veiled from the Beauty of the Ipseity. This group of people have collected in themselves both the yearning and the joy of attainment in yearning because they are in one way veiled and in another way arrived.

Coming face to face is according to three parts, and for each of these parts there is death, resurrection and the Day of Judgement. The first coming face to face happens by natural death, and in this resurrection and the Day of Judgement happens according to what the Envoy said: 'Dead, but present in the Day of Judgement', and also the words: 'People are asleep and when they die they wake up.' This rising after resurrection for coming face to face are from among those people of happiness who believe in the *ghayb* and who are veiled and who see the *ḥaqq* in the images of their beliefs by virtue of the degrees of the believers, seeing in the universe of *mithāl* or in the figures of the high skies. For the people of the heart this vision happens in the most beautiful way in the isthmuses of spiritual light. For the people of *shuhūd* this happens in all the images of existence according to the relationship of their degree of annihilation from their ipseity and the vision of *ḥaqq* with the 'ayn of the *ḥaqq* according to their own apportioning of absoluteness and relativity. If these wished for conditioning (which is relativity) the High God orders them with the same conditioning and relativity. 'They do not wish for other than except what God wishes, because their will is the will of God.' When they annihilated themselves from their own ipseity and their qualifications remained with them in which way. In this Day of Judgement all the people are the same, and this Day of Judgement by degree is small and by comprehension the big, but the truth is that it is a country from among the countries of the big Day of Judgement. That is why the Envoy said: 'The tomb is the first station from among the stations of the other world.' But the Day of Judgement of the people of the heart is divestment from the clothes of the senses and

being resurrected in this world from the tomb of the body, and becomes possible by advancing in the universe of holiness and by mapping their way towards the group of the *malakût*, and this is known as the middle Day of Judgement and is the middle of all the areas of the big Day of Judgement, and this happens after the cutting away of any interest in the life of the *nafs* and with very strong certainty and after the wilful death, as it has been said: 'Died by the will, lives by nature.' But the Day of Judgement of the people of witnessing is the great overwhelmingness which happens after finding *fanâ'* in the *haqq* and having finished with *fanâ'* in the *khalq* by the lifting of the veil of light and darkness of the *jalâl* and they being burnt by the light of the everlasting face of *jamâl*. The Envoy said: 'God has 70,000 veils of light and shade, and if the opening of these has not burnt the lauding face (the laudations of the face) the eye does not reach that which has created him.' The prince of the believers, 'Ali, whose face God made generous (*karim*), said: 'The reality of *kashf* is praise for the *jalâl* without a mark or signal', and this *fanâ'* is the real natural death for everybody. And the Day of Judgement that happens after this *fanâ'* is *baqâ'* after *fanâ'* for that gnostic who observes his own devolution for that which is devolved as a relationship to his ipseity and the ipseity of things, and sees all that as the same as the *haqq* and that he be constantly seeing the *haqq* as the same as that, and be constantly in face to face, and be in *fanâ'* of his own ipseity and be in *baqâ'* with his Lord. Of the degrees of coming face to face, each degree does not become realized except through death, and he does not taste of death after that. 'They do not taste death except the first death.' After the *fanâ'* of the *khalq* is *bâqi* the face of the *haqq*.

The Beloved yearns to see Me
And My yearning is even stronger for him,
The *nafs* yearns and the destiny prevents it,
I complain from lament and he also complains
from lament.

According to the meaning of the *ḥadīth qudsi*: 'My yearning for them is stronger . . .', the Shaykh here speaks with the word of the *haqq* or the Shaykh here speaks with the word of the Shaykh, and says: 'My Beloved is yearning for My vision, but My yearning for My Beloved's face is even stronger than his yearning for Me', because the servant's yearning for the *haqq* is from the servant's love for the

ḥaqq, but the servant's love of the *ḥaqq* is due to the *ḥaqq*'s love of the servant. God said: 'He loves them and they love Him' (*yuhibbuhum wa yuḥibbūnahu*). If there had not been the love of the *ḥaqq* for the servants, the servant would not have loved the *ḥaqq*. Consequently the servant's yearning for the *ḥaqq* is due to the *ḥaqq*'s yearning for the servant. However, the *ḥaqq*'s yearning for the servants is stronger, because the servant's love and yearning for the *ḥaqq* is a portion of the love and yearning of the *ḥaqq* for the servant, and the *ḥaqq*'s love and yearning for the servant is total. The servant yearns only in accordance with his devolved 'ayn and his established reality, whereas the *ḥaqq*, being devolved with the manifest and hidden devolved beings and the reality of the *ghayb*, is yearning with absoluteness (*itlâq*) and non-*ta'ayyun*. Thus, in the servant's devolvement there is by virtue of the *ḥaqq*'s devolution of the yearning of the *ḥaqq* for Its own *nafs* by virtue of Its total devolvement in the degree of Divinity. Equally the *ḥaqq*'s yearning by virtue of His *la ta'ayyun* is equally stronger and dominant. The phrase '*tahfī nufûs*' (though in certain copies it is '*tahwī*') shows the yearning *nufûs* in suffering due to the strength of the desire of reaching facing, and from the love of death which is a means to arrive at that, which is prevented by destiny. This last bit means this: since the High *ḥaqq* has ordered and determined for each being an appointed death (*ajal musamma*), no death is possibly envisaged before the arrival of that time, and coming face to face is not possible before then. 'When the destiny (*qadâ*) which is delineated and a known time is over, then I complain from lament and the Beloved equally complains from lament.' When the High *ḥaqq* (said: 'When I blew into it from My Spirit') elucidated it and made it apparent that in fact He blew into that human place of manifestation from His Total Spirit, consequently the *ḥaqq* did not yearn for the yearning servant but to His own *nafs* which is devolved in the 'ayn of the servant, and to His own Spirit which is blown into the servant's place of manifestation from His own Spirit. And the Shaykh's saying: 'And when He elucidated that He blew into it from His own Spirit, He did not yearn except for His own *nafs*', is the result of what he said before. Consequently, the *ḥaqq*'s yearning for the yearning servant at the level of death is His own yearning for His own *nafs* which at the level of the removal of the immanential veil appears in the place of manifestation of the servant, the total manifestation and His yearning

for His total manifestation, because the perfection of knowledge in the place of manifestation of the servant results with total manifestation, because in the words: 'I loved to be known', love appertains to knowledge. Consequently, the *haqq*'s love and yearning is for the manifestation and the total manifesting of Himself in the perfect servant. Do you not see He created him (it) in His own image because he is from His own Spirit? That is to say, do you not see the *haqq* who created the man in His own image which is the image of the Divine totality, because certainly the man is from His Total Spirit which is the Divine Spirit devolved at the degree of Divinity and from the *nafs-i-rahmânî* blown into him with all the properties of the totality of that degree.

When his emergence happened from these four elements which are called in the body 'humours', which are the component parts of the body and which are blood, bile, black bile and mucous; that is why the Shaykh mentioned the body, because outside the body these four humours are known as the component elements; there came about in the *nafs* an ignition (inflaming) because there is in the body some humidity. Consequently, there came about in the human *nafs* an ignition through the humidity in the body, which means that the normal warmth of the body became ignited (inflamed) with the normal humidity of the human. The matter of the normal human warmth is the natural humidity. The remaining of the heat is dependent on the remaining of the humidity. When the humidity disappears, heat also disappears. Consequently, the animal spirit of the human which results in the life of its body becomes fire from the point of view of the emergence of his body's constitution, because his bodily emergence includes the four humours. The human spirit which appears in that emergence becomes apparent due to the place. That is to say, the natural heat of the body which causes the ignition, manifests in the fire image. It is because of this that God did not speak to Moses except in the image of fire and brought about what Moses needed at that time in fire. That is to say, the human spirit appears in the body in the image of fire. That is why the High God did not address Moses except through the image of fire. Also because Moses' need was for fire, which means that He made Moses need fire and revealed Himself to him in fire. Because 'Moses' emergence is original and is made up of the four humours and is composed of them, and having appeared to him in the image of what he needed, He revealed

Himself to him and addressed him, because not only was Moses' emergence inclusive of fire (did Moses' emergence include fire) but in his emergence the quality of *jalâl* and fire are dominant.

If his (man's) emergence had been natural, his spirit would have been of light. This means that if man's emergence had been according to the nature of the origin of his emergence and not influenced by the nature of elements, his spirit would not have been fiery but would have remained of light, like the angels who are above the seven heavens, but man's spirit becomes apparent by virtue of the place (the place where his emergence takes place). Equally, God points to (the fact) the blowing and that is from the *nafs-i-rahmânî*. The High God makes reference to the blowing of the Spirit into the man or equally He makes reference to the Spirit, as one is that He blew, or that the Spirit blew, according to the saying: 'And I blew into it of My Spirit.' Without a doubt then, the human spirit is of the *nafs-i-rahmânî*. In other words, it is blown from the *nafs-i-rahmânî*, thereby making the *nafs-i-rahmânî* manifest in the man. Consequently, certainly the 'ayn of man, that is to say his external being, manifests with this *nafs* which is the Divine blowing, and due to the inclination of that in which it was blown happened the ignition of fire and not of light. This inclination is due to the body of the man. That is why because of that which it was blown into that man's emergence became fire and not light. Because that which is blown into and which has the inclination to receive that which is blown into is elemental matter. Consequently, in there light becomes igneous and fiery rather than remain as light, because his emergence is elemental and not natural light. The *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* became hidden (*bâtin*) in this place and because of which man became man. In other words, in the animal spirit the *nafs-i-rahmânî* became hidden and man became manifest.

And then He yearned for it. After this the High God made for man, which is Adam, another person which desired him, according to his image, and which He called woman. That is, from Adam, according to his image, He created Eve and called it woman, thereby the woman came into manifestation in the image of man, which is Adam, just as man became manifest in the image of the *ḥaqq*. Adam yearned for and loved the woman, just as a thing's love and yearning for its own *nafs*, because his own *nafs* in the second degree was apparent in the image of the woman and is therein devolved. Equally, the woman-

became longing and yearning for him, like a thing's longing and yearning for the country of its origin, because woman came out of him. Woman became lovable to him, and indeed God loves that which He has created in His own image, and He made angels of light prostrate themselves to him even though their value and their stations were great and their natural emergence very high.

Then, in appearance there happens a relationship between man and the *ḥaqq* because man is created according to the image of the *ḥaqq*, and woman is created according to the image of the man. Equally, the *ḥaqq*'s yearning and longing for the man, who is created according to the image of *ḥaqq*, is His longing and yearning for His own Self, and man's longing and yearning for the *ḥaqq* is a thing's longing and yearning for its origin and its country. Man's longing and yearning for the woman is man's longing and yearning for his own *nafs*, and woman's longing and yearning for the man is a thing's longing and yearning for its origin and its country. Consequently, from both sides the longing is due to the relationship that happens in the image and its necessary consequence. Relationship happens in the image which is because the images of the Names of the Divine *ghayb* are manifest in the images of witnessing of Adamic possibilities (possibilities of man-ness, Adam-ness). Just as the Divinity collects in itself the images of the Divine Names, Adam equally collects in itself the images of human samplers, and the Adamic image is derived from the Divine image like the appearance and derivation of Eve from Adam. Consequently, man's longing for the woman is an example of God's longing for man, and the image is the greatest relationship and the grandest (*ajall*) and the most perfect. The situation is that the collectivity of the human image is the greatest relationship between the *ḥaqq* and man, and equally the grandest and the most perfect relationship, because the human image collects in itself the totality of the eternal Divine images and the images of immanential possibilities, and this is coupling. That is to say, the human image is coupled to the Being of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the manifestation of the Being of the *ḥaqq* in the image of man. The woman, by her manifest being, is coupled to the man. When man was singular, woman coupled it. When the man's being was devolved into the degree of maleness, by a second devolution he was devolved in the being of the woman, and by virtue of that, man became a couple. In other words, for man couple-ness resulted by the woman which was derived from him. Just as

in the same way for the *haqq*, being a pair (pairness) became manifest by the being of the human.

Thus manifested the triad of *haqq*, man and woman. Consequently, by this triplicity, singularity came about. Man became manifest in the image of the *haqq*. The woman became manifest in the image of man. The *haqq* became longing and yearning for the man, and man became longing and yearning for the woman, just as something longs and yearns for its own *nafs*. Thus the *haqq* manifested in the image of the man and man manifested in the image of the woman, and according to this consideration, in the third combination *haqq* manifested in the image of the woman. In the emergence of the human-kind this singularity is exemplified by spirit, heart or *nafs*, or as *haqq*, spirit and body, where the spirit is according to the image of *haqq*, and the body is according to the image of the spirit, and while the spirit was one, the image of the body paired it (made it a pair.).

Man has an ardent desire, a yearning for his Lord because the Lord is his origin, and woman has a yearning for man in the same way because he is her origin. The yearning of the man for the *haqq* and of the woman for man is the same as of a thing yearning for its own country. But it is God who made the woman beloved to man, just as God loved someone who is according to His own image. Then man's love did not happen except for that person which is immanenced from him, and that which is immanenced from him is woman, and in reality man's love happened for that being from whom the man is immanenced, and that is the *haqq*. In other words, when the man is established upon the Divine love which is his origin, he loved the woman with a Divine love, not with the love of his own *nafs*. Again in other words, because the Divine love is established upon man, the Envoy Mohammed said: 'I was made to love . . .', and did not say: 'I loved from my own *nafs* . . .', meaning that he was made to love from and by God, and he did not say: 'I loved of my own being . . .', because his love appertains to the Absolute *rabb*, according to whose image he is. In other words, his love for the *haqq* which is his origin is essential, and his love for the woman which is devolved from him is by being made to love from God. Even in the love man has for his woman, the man's love appertains to God, because in reality the man loves a woman through the love of God because of his nature being of the Divine nature. In the saying: 'And indeed you are according to a grand nature', the nature of the Envoy is according to the Divine

nature. (Note: the archetypal Perfect Man's nature being the result of an extension without extension, its nature is essentially that of the Ipseity. Consequently, all devolutions, individuations or manifestations of the archetypal Perfect Man present in the universes are according to that same essential grand nature, otherwise there could be no possibility for the grandiose scheme of the isthmuseity.) For this instance the wife of the Prophet (may peace be on them both), 'Aishah, said: 'His nature was the Quran.' Because the High God made man in His own image and loved him, man, being natured by the Divine nature of love and the Divine love being manifest in him, loved the woman which immanenced from him with a Divine love. The reason for man's love of woman being, from the side of the man, of Divine love is this. The Divine love which is manifested in the image of man is through its nature and manifestation in him Divine love, and by reason of manifestedness and natured the love from the side of the woman is Divine love because woman is also the place of manifestation of the Divine. The image of the *haqq* is manifest in man and the image of man is manifest in woman, consequently the *haqq*'s love for the man and the man's love for the woman is the love of the *haqq* for Its own *nafs*. When the man loved the woman through the Divine love he demanded union. That is to say, he asked for the union which is the aim of love, and there has been never a greater union and arrival in the emergence of the human genus except in the image of marriage (conjoining), like a heavy rain thoroughly penetrating the earth in the union of man and woman. In another way one can say, in the images of the emergence of this genus there has not been a greater union than marriage, conjoining. The word 'marriage' is symbolical, is of the manner of transcending the name of the cause according to that which is caused. Because of the grandeur of the union of conjoining, at the moment of union the essential desire of the man becomes general to all parts of the person, and the desire penetrating to all parts of the man, the man finds *fanâ*' at this point. It is because of this total penetration of desire in man that when he has union with the woman he is ordered to wash away with total ablution, because during his desire for the woman the man was totally annihilated in her in all his parts. There was no part of man left in the occupation with the *haqq*, yet in the images of this emergence of mankind there has not been a greater union than that which happens to be present at the level of the coming about of this

desire of man for the woman wherein he finds *fanâ'*. In fact the High God is jealous over His servant that the servant should believe that he could find taste and pleasure in other than the *haqq*. So the *haqq* is jealous over His servant that he should believe that he should find pleasure and taste in woman other than Himself, and that he, man, believe that this pleasure and taste is possible with other than *haqq*. That is why He recleanses His servant with ablution so that he returns to *haqq*, and that instead of finding *fanâ'* in woman that he should look back at *haqq* and find *fanâ'* in Him. Consequently, God washed His servant clean from believing in taste and pleasure in other than *haqq* Itself, and ordered him to ablute. The Shaykh means by this 'belief in finding taste and pleasure in another' the people of beliefs, who see the woman as differentiated from the *haqq* and believe that it is 'another', but the '*ârif* is witness that he witnesses the *haqq* in every form, and he consequently witnesses the *haqq* in the best of ways in the woman because the woman is manifest in the form of the man. The '*ârif* observes and witnesses the God's action with relation to the man and God's activation according to the woman, because order and moment, willingly or unwillingly, is impossible without being brought about by the *haqq*. Consequently, it is without a doubt that the man in this worldly emergence returns to the *haqq* in the place of manifestation of the woman, having witnessed the *haqq* in that without a doubt. When the man observes the *haqq* in the woman, at the moment of conjunction (arrival) he witnesses the *haqq* by His manifestation in the image of effectedness (*munfa'il*) through an effected intermediary from the *haqq*, and the *haqq* is manifest in there in the image of being effected (*infi'âl*). Consequently, he observes the *haqq* by virtue of His manifesting in the image of effectedness because the woman is the place of effectation, and also because the woman is the image of the man and that the man becomes manifest in her. Consequently, because of this, he equally observes Him in the effector which manifests in the result. Now if the man observes *haqq* in his own *nafs*, because of the woman's manifesting from him, he observes the *haqq* in the effector in relation to the woman which has manifested from the man by virtue of which situation the woman becomes the effector. Consequently, he observes *haqq* in his own *nafs* with the quality of effectorshipness. If the man observes the *haqq* in his own *nafs* by virtue of the fact that this does not encompass that which immanences from

him, that is to say, as it does not encompass the image of the woman which is immanenced from himself, the man's observation happens without an intermediary from *haqq* in the effected because his own *nafs* is without an intermediary effected from the *haqq*. Consequently, in his own *nafs* his observation of the *haqq* is according to the first condition. According to the second condition it is according to the observation in the effected which his own *nafs* without intermediary effected by the *haqq*. Therefore the man's observation which observes the *haqq* in its final and most complete manner happens in the woman, because when the man observes *haqq* in the woman, by virtue of the fact that the *haqq* is both effector and effected as He manifests as actor in the man and as effected in the woman, and because the man's image is manifest in the woman as the *haqq* is manifest as effector in there, hence the *haqq* is observed by virtue of His being the effector, and because the woman is without an intermediary effected upon by the man and is effected by *haqq* through an intermediary, and because the *haqq* is manifest in there by the quality of being effected upon, the *haqq* is therein observed by virtue of His being effected upon. Consequently, the observation of the *haqq* in the woman happens both in the case of effector and of effected, and this observation is more complete and perfect and final than if the observation was specifically for the effector or specifically for the effected. The observation of the man of the *haqq* in his own *nafs* happens by virtue of the fact that the man is effected upon, and in relation to the woman his observation in his own *nafs* happens specifically in the effector. Here the Shaykh abandons the mentioning of the third factor, which is the observation of the *haqq* in the effector, in spite of the fact that in the first division of the factors there was an indication that there would be a mention of this division.

Because the observation of the *haqq* in the woman is the most complete and the most perfect and final, the Envoy (*salâm* upon him) loved women with the Divine induced love because of the perfect observation of the *haqq* in the woman. But it is from the place of manifestation of Mohammed. It is impossible that he should observe *haqq* in the best manner in them because since the *haqq* is devoid of matter He can never be observed, because indeed the High God in His Ipseity is *ghaniyy* of the universes and therefore can never be observed in the universes, and He is observable only in His manifestation of qualities and qualifications in the material world, and is

observed in the woman in the best manner because therein He appears in the qualities of actor and the effected. Consequently, the Perfect Man observes the *haqq* in the emergence of the genus of the images in the best manner in the image of the woman. And this observation happens in his vision, and this vision does not exist in the vision of the lacking man and this observation is not an observation necessary for the man's perfection. It is because they are imperfection it is not necessary that the *haqq* manifest totally in them, and therefore it is not the same as the manifesting of the *haqq* in total manifestation in the Perfect Man, and it is not the observation of the *haqq* in it with total observation. Do not be misled in this, because it is only in the perfect vision wherein in other places of manifestation in the genres of the immanence wherein he sees the *haqq* by virtue of the place of manifestation of the *haqq*; therefore the Perfect Man, by virtue of the fact that the *haqq* manifests in the woman by action and effected-upon-ness, therein observes the *haqq* in them in the best of manners, better than in any other image.

If the order of observation is prevented by virtue of the fact that the *haqq* is devoid of matter, if the order of observation is thus prevented and if the observation of the *haqq* was impossible to observe without matter, by virtue of the fact that the *haqq* is manifest and revealed in the matters of images of genus and nature, in that case the observation of the *haqq* in the woman is certainly the greatest and the most perfect observation, and the greatest arrival is in marriage, and in this manner mentioned, in the event. The event is an example of Divine facing. That is to say, it is an example of His facing through that which emanates from the *haqq*'s Essential Divine Love upon that person which the *haqq* has created according to His own image, so that it becomes His *khalifah*, so that the *haqq* in his place of manifestation observes His own *nafs*, for which He arranged and levelled him and blew into him of His own Spirit which is His own *nafs*. The outward manifestation of man which He created in His own image is creation, his immanence, and his interior is the *haqq*, because the Divine Spirit is the *nafs* of the *rahmân*. The event is the example of the Divine facing because the man by virtue of this event wishes to manifest his own image, perhaps even for the creation of the *khalifahs* which follow after the creation of Adam, the Father of mankind, and the place of manifestation of the Divine facing towards them happens through this event, because there, images of the human

genus become individuated at that level and are manifested therein; when the Divine Love by Divine Will faces towards the creation of a *khalîfah*, that love manifests in the place of manifestation of a man who then, to manifest this *khalîfah* of the *ḥaqq*, faces towards the event. And because the man's outside is immanence and his interior is the *ḥaqq* that the High God planned (*tadbîr*) man for this image which is the totality of the universes, and qualified him by it, because the High *ḥaqq* indeed plans the order of being from the heavens, and the heavens are elevation, that is to say, by bringing down to earth the effusion of being from the elevated Divine Names, and the earth is the *asfal-i-sâfilîn* because the earth is the lowest of all directions and corners. Consequently, the heavens, by the Divine effusion of the Names, plans the universal effected images in the earth of possibilities, and the *ḥaqq* being the interior of man and man being created in His image becomes the *khalîfah* of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, man being the total of the Divine images of the Names of actions and the images of the effected-upon possibilities of immanence, he, the man, receiving the Divine effusion from the Presences of the Names, brings them down to the earth of possibilities, thus planning the order of being. And in the emergence of mankind, the heavens which are high are the image of the man, and the earth which is low is the image of the woman, thus the *ḥaqq*, having brought down the effusion through the man which is high to the woman which is low, plans the order of being of man. In this, the Shaykh points at the five marriages of Divine totality which cause the completion of the universes of meanings, and of the spirits, and of the *nafs*, and of the *mithâl*, and of the senses. The five marriages, which are known as the five Presences or the five universes, is for the Uniqueness of the Ipseity a Divine descent to the universe of witnessing which is in the images of the action and acted-upon-ness, of which universes the last one is the universe of the senses, is compared to marriages and is thereby called the five marriages, but the state is that the One Reality is manifest in the images of action and acted-upon-ness, whose outside is the universe and whose inside is the *ḥaqq*, and the inside of this Reality plans its outside, and in reality the *ḥaqq* is both outside and inside, both manifest and hidden, because Divine descent is nothing other than individuations and happenings in the images of the Names which are in the immanential images of the results are the causes for the Ipseity of the Uniqueness. The first of the descents is the

revelation of the Ipscity in the images of the non-brought-about *a'yân-i-thâbita*. The second is the descent from the universe of meaning to the spiritual individuation which is a descent in the universe of spirits. The third is the descent in the individuation of the *nufûs* which is the universe of the speaking *nufûs*, and the fourth is the descent appertaining to *mithâl* which is without matter of body or form or analogy, and this is the universe of *mithâl*. And the fifth is the universe of material bodies and the universe of senses and witnessing. And these four descents are former enterprises (*mutaqaddim*) of the degrees of the *ghayb* for the high which is lower than themselves, and they are like results for the high which is lower than themselves for the degrees of the *ghayb*, and for that which is higher than that which is lower than them they are like results which happen action and acted-upon-ness, and for this reason the Divine descents are called marriages.

The Envoy (peace be on him) called women '*nisâ*', and the word *nisâ*' is plural for women which has no singular. The other Arabic word for woman is '*mar'âh*' which has no plural, but the word *nisâ*' (root *nasâ'a*) has another meaning which is 'retarding, putting off to later', like in the Quranic sentence: 'Putting off to later is more prevalent in covering up the Truth' (in which sentence *nasî'* means putting off to later and does not mean women). In this case, as Mohammed puts it, the word *nisâ*' respects the fact that women are drawn from Adam and therefore they are later than Adam, and to show that his love for women was not emanating from him he said: 'I was made to love three things from your world, women . . .', showing that his love for women was emanating not from his own self but from God. That is why he said: 'I was made to love . . .' rather than: 'I loved . . .' Consequently, because in being there is a consideration of women being posterior to Adam, respecting this situation he used the word *nisâ*'. Again, denoting the fact that he was made to love women because of their degree, denoted in the saying: 'And men have degrees', and since by degree the woman is created according to the image of the man and equally in degree descends from him and that degree is its effectedness from men, and indeed *nisâ*' is the place of effectedness from among the images of the humankind and the humankind manifests from man by them. God's love became appertaining to the knowledge of God and the knowledge of God is resultant by the humankind, consequently the existence of the humankind

is manifest by the Divine love. Thus it is a place of effectation. Consequently, *nisâ'* which is the place of effectedness and the place of manifestation of the humankind, the Divine love became appertaining to *nisâ'*, and the love of the Envoy appertained to this because of the degree of the place of effectedness.

Women for men is like Nature, and for the *ḥaqq* it is such a Nature that in there the High God opens up the images of the universe by the facing of His Will and Divine order. That Divine facing and Divine order in the universe of the images of the genus is marriage. In the universe of the spirits of light it is *himmah*, and to arrive at result it is the arrangements of steps in the meanings. And the totality of all this is the marriage of primordial singularity, from all these faces in each of these faces, to open up in them the images of the Nature. Women for man is like Nature for the *ḥaqq*, because man opens up the images of the humankind in women and the images of the humankind become manifest in them, just as Nature is the exterior of the *ḥaqq* and the *ḥaqq* is the *bâtin* of Nature, where the *ḥaqq* creates through the facing of the Will and the Divine order, together with the *nafs-i-rahmânî* opens up the images of the universe in the Nature. In the universe of the images of the genus the facing of the Will and of the Divine order is marriage, so that the images which are in the universe of genres are opened up through that. In the universe of the spirits of light it is *himmah*. The images of the universe of spirits become opened by that. In the universe of meanings the results are meanings because images of meanings are manifest by arrangement of steps. In all these faces mentioned, all the images which are manifested in each of the facings is the marriage of the primordial singularity. That is to say, the prime singularity, which is the Ipseity, Will and Word, refers to their conjugation and their marriage is then branched out, as manifesting and manifestation results from the trinity of singularity which is the Ipseity and Will and Word. The resultings which happen through these above-mentioned facings is built upon that singularity, in other words, in the images of the genus by marriage, in the universe of spirits by *himmah*, and the universe of meanings by the arrangement of steps, that the manifesting is according to trinity.

If a person loves women according to the degree of the love of the Prophet, which degree is that women is the place of effectedness and the place of manifesting of the *ḥaqq*, then that man's love is Divine love, which means that he loves the *ḥaqq* and becomes tasteful of

that. But if a man loves the women by natural particular desire of nature, the knowledge of the desire of this kind becomes lacking in him, and he becomes lacking in that knowledge because he has not comprehended that that desire and love is the image of the Divine love and did not understand with whom he tasted by what he was given to taste, and at their level their love for women and their finding taste in that is like an image without a spirit. Even though that image of the *nafs* is the ipseity of spirit in the order in the vision of a person who looks at it with the Divine love, even though that image is not visible for the person who approaches his woman or his slave girl only through pleasure no matter what that female's position happens to be, that is to say, whether she is married to him or not, and since his approach is entirely for pleasure, that is to say, he approaches the woman entirely for the pleasure of desire, he does not comprehend whom he loves and with whom he finds pleasure. Even though that image in the view of the man inspired by Divine love has spirit, in the vision of the man who approaches the woman entirely for pleasure, that image which has a spirit because its spirit is the Divine love and Divine pleasure, is not visible to that man, and at his level the image is spiritless, and he takes pleasure in natural desire and does not realize with whom he takes pleasure and who is taking pleasure through him. Except in the sight of the people of Divine love this image is without spirit. The people of knowledge who take pleasure in their place of manifestation and in the place of manifestation of women in whom they take pleasure. This means, for he who approaches women from the point of view of pleasure has become ignorant of his *nafs* in that thing that others are equally ignorant of it in him, that is, he did not know that his *nafs* is one of the places of manifestation of Divine manifestations and was ignorant that woman was created according to his image, in other words he did not know whose is the pleasure in the place of manifestation of woman and who takes pleasure. And just as he does not know with whom he had pleasure, equally others do not know, since he does not name it by his own tongue so that others know, that is, no other knows that he took pleasure in conjunction if he does not name with which conjunction he took pleasure, because nobody has pleasure in his pleasure. If 'other' is people of *kashf* and knowledge, in their view this pleasure is possible for the two faces. If he is of the people of the Divine love he takes pleasure with the *haqq* in the place of manifestation of

women, and if he is of the people of natural desires he takes pleasure in the conjunction itself. No one else knows with whom he has taken pleasure if he does not name it, and from its appearances the others know that he takes pleasure in the conjunction, and if it is considered that the man who takes pleasure in the conjunction does necessarily take pleasure through the Divine love, others do not know of him that he took pleasure through the Divine love and think that he took pleasure through natural desire since he has not specified by naming it with his own tongue that he took pleasure through Divine love so that through this indication they know it is so. There has been somebody who said in a poem:

‘True indeed that among people I am known
as a lover,
But others, though they know I am in love,
they do not know with whom.’

The person in this verse points at the fact that people think that I am in love with creature, but in reality my love is for the *ḥaqq* which reveals Itself and is manifest in the place of manifestation of the created, and do not know whom I love.

This man, like another, approaches women with desire, equally loves pleasure, that is, he loved that place in which pleasure is present. That place is woman, but the spirit of the matter is lost from him, and the matter in hand is that that man is the place of manifestation of the *ḥaqq*, and the knowledge that also the woman, being created according to his image, is the place of manifestation of the *ḥaqq*. In short, this knowledge is lost for him, and he only loved the place of pleasure which is woman, but had he known the matter in question, he certainly would have known with whom he was finding pleasure and who it was who found pleasure, and he would have been complete in knowledge and vision. In other words, he would have known that he took pleasure with the *ḥaqq* in the place of manifestation of the woman, and that which takes pleasure in his own place of manifestation is the *ḥaqq*, and he would have been complete in knowledge and witnessing because he would have observed the *ḥaqq* as actor in his own place of manifestation and would have observed the *ḥaqq* both as actor and acted upon in the place of manifestation of woman.

Just as woman descended from a degree from a man, which is

attested by the quote: 'Men have degrees', which establishes that woman descended from man's degree who has descended from the degree of the *ḥaqq*, since he was created according to the image and was built according to His image, although he was in the image of the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, even though man is created according to the image of the *ḥaqq*, he descends a degree from there. Woman, who is according to the image of man, descends a degree from there. And that is the degree through which the *ḥaqq* is differentiated from man, thereby the *ḥaqq* becomes in no need of man, in no need of the universes, though He is the first actor, because the *ḥaqq* becomes differentiated from man by His non-*ta'ayyun* and by His Essential transcendence, whereas man by his need of the *ḥaqq* because he needs *ta'ayyun* and being, whereas the *ḥaqq* remains beyond need of the universes by His degree of Essential transcendence because that degree is devoid of the degree of plurality which is the universe. The second degree, which is the reality of man which is the first degree of non-*ta'ayyun*, by virtue of the *ḥaqq* being in *ta'ayyun* in it, God does not become devoid of relative plurality. Yet the reality remains indeed, the *ta'ayyun awwal*, which is the totality of the reality of mankind, is the second actor, and the primordality which is for the Absolute *ḥaqq* does not exist for him, because the primordality of the *ḥaqq* is due to the primordality of the Ipseity, and the primordality of the man which is the image of the *ḥaqq* is *ta'ayyun* and the primordality of the Knowledge of the *ghayb*, and the man remains, by virtue of his being the *khalifah* of the *ḥaqq* through being the image of the *ḥaqq*, the universe of second actor. In other words, he is the second degree for the act of the *ḥaqq*. And do not conjecture in this the existence of both actors, because the *ḥaqq* is the first actor by virtue of the non-neediness of His own Ipseity and that He has created man in His own image through which image He is the second actor. That is to say, by His *ta'ayyun* in him, by virtue of His *ta'ayyun* in him with His Names and Qualities, is the actor of the images of immanence. Consequently, by virtue of the fact that man is created in the image of the *ḥaqq*, through the degree of imageness he is differentiated from the Absolute *ḥaqq* by virtue of his being *ta'ayyuned*, and there is no primordality of Ipseity of necessarily-sonness for him.

First of all, the *a'yân* of the *ghayb* became differentiated one from the other by relative differentiation in the First *ta'ayyun* through the

degrees of Essential Knowledge by virtue of their un-brought-about inclinations of the *ghayb* because the *ḥaqq* became differentiated from them by degrees of non-*ta'ayyun*. Equally, the *a'yân* of the immanential existences became differentiated one from the other by virtue of the degrees of the *ghayb* and the *a'yân thâbita* within the expanse of receptability and the places of manifestability of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, the *ḥaqq* became differentiated from man, which is created according to the *ḥaqq*'s own image, through the *ḥaqq*'s Essential Richness-beyond-Need and degree of non-*ta'ayyun*. In the same manner, man became differentiated from It, and consequently he is not by this consideration possessor of firstness. Equally, man became differentiated from woman which is created according to his image, and equally woman in the same degree became differentiated from man. The One Being of the *ḥaqq* became *muta'ayyin* in the degree of man and in the degree of woman, but He is *muta'ayyin* in each of these in consequence of their essence and the reality of their being made *muta'ayyin*, so that in man He is through his actorness and through his precedencing activation, and in the degree of the woman through its effected-upon-ness and through ending of acted-upon-ness. The revelation of the Most Holy Effusion and the Holy Effusion which is *muta'ayyin* in the Presence of Divinity are equally revealed upon the *a'yân* of knowledge of the *ghayb* and the *a'yân* of external being, but manifestation of revelation happens in consequence of the aptitude of the *a'yân* and the inclinations of the places of manifestation, and this is how each becomes differentiated from the other. Each *'ârif* (who is in knowledge of realities and degrees) gives its due and reality to each of those who have in them their desert, that is to say, the High *ḥaqq* gives to each *'ayn* its desert by virtue of its inclination, consequently equally each perfect *'ârif* gives the desert of everything and determines (*ḥukm*) it by virtue of its place of manifestability, and differentiates them one from the other, and by virtue of each *'ayn*, in that *'ayn* he observes the *ḥaqq*.

Because the *'ârif* definitely gives its desert to everything, that love of women was given through Divine causing to love to Mohammed (peace be on him), and indeed the High God gave to each its own nature, in other words, He bestows upon each *'ayn* its reality by virtue of its degree and his differentiated essence, which he deserves by virtue of his *'ayn*. And the nature of each thing that God has given

it is definitely its desert which is its reality and its necessity by virtue of its *'ayn thâbita*. In other words, the High God did not bestow its nature to each thing except that that thing deserved it, which thing deserved it through its own Name by which it is named or appointed. In other words, that thing deserved that through what its essence and its *'ayn* deserved.

To women, who are effected through man, in the degree of culmination of effectedness and in the place of manifestation of women, He revealed Himself with the quality of being loved, and bestowed on them the attraction of the hearts of men and the inclination of men towards them. For the man, who is created in His own image, who is the actor of the second degree, in his actorness gave him his due in initiatoriness over women and bestowed on them the love for the women; and to the man who is *'ârif* of the reality of the order He bestowed the observation of the *ḥaqq* in the total and the taking of pleasure with the *ḥaqq*, which is its nature and its desert because he is observant of the *ḥaqq* in the total. Consequently, he takes pleasure with the *ḥaqq* in the total. And to the ignorant man who is not *'ârif* of the *ḥaqq* in the images of the universe, He bestowed upon him his nature which is the image of finding pleasure exclusively with the place, which at his level has no spirit. Thus He bestowed upon Mohammed (peace be on him) who is an *'ârif* and whose desert was love of women, and he then through Divine causing to love gave the desert of women and loved them.

The Envoy (peace be on him), in the *ḥadîth* mentioned, first mentioned women, over beautiful perfume and the pupil of the eyes in prayer, because indeed women is the place of being effected, and the women which is the place of being effected is the origin of the being of the humankind, whereas the perfumes and the pupils of the eye in prayer is of the necessities of the humankind. Consequently, Nature came first by its image of being effected-upon-ness, over the things which become existent from it. That which becomes manifest and existent through Nature are the images of the universe. That is to say, Nature takes primordality over things which become existent from it through imaging, because things that are existent in Nature through external images are existent through imaging and are established for mental exclusion; for example, like the Divine Names, which are established in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* but are *muta'ayyin* in the Presence of Knowledge and their images are manifest in Nature and

for the totality of images of Nature is like *hayûlâ*. Images of the Divine Names and the images of beings of necessarily-so-ness are manifest in Nature with the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*. The matter is that the Nature in reality is no other than the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* because in fact the state is such that in the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* the images of the highest universes and the lowest universe became blown in and became manifest in them, because the Breath of *rahmân* in the jewel of *hayûlâ* was fluent, concerning specifically the universe of bodies, including stars and planets. Because the *nafs-i-raḥmânî* was fluent in the jewel of the *hayûlâ* through the agency of the jewel of *hayûlâ*, in a certain way the images of the universe became manifest in the *nafs-i-raḥmânî*, and in one way the *nafs-i-raḥmânî* bears the images of the universe and the images of the universe become manifest in Nature which is the jewel of *hayûlâ*. Consequently, by virtue of what is manifest, although Nature is in the third degree from the degree of the Prime Intellect which is the beginning of being, but in reality Nature is the same as the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, because the existence of Nature which is an intelligent order is existent by the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, and Nature is the exterior of the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* and the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* is the interior of the Nature, therefore for the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* and the image of the *ḥaqq*, Nature is like the manifested image of thing. Consequently, the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* prevails over the images of the universe of the high spirits, the universe of the low bodies, and the Divine Names and the realities of action of necessarily-so-nesses and the immanent manifestations and the receptivities of effectedness of possibilities. Consequently, in the degree of the Nature, which is the degree of manifestation of the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, and that these images are consequently the same as the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, they are manifest in the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*. And in another way, by virtue of the suggestion of the images of effectedness of immanence and images of Divine action by the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, these images become manifest in Nature because Nature is the place of acted-upon-ness, just as for the man the woman is the place of effectedness wherein the images of the progeniture become apparent. In yet another way, the images of the universe become apparent in the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* because the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* is for the images of the universe the jewel of the *hayûlâ*, and Nature for the Divine and immanent images the reality of actor. In the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* the actornesses are activized the images of the effectedness of the

receptive *a'yân*. Consequently, Nature is in one way actor and in another way acted upon. But nevertheless, for the specific purpose of manifesting the images of bodies and planets of the universe, the Breath of *rahmân* is fluent in the relative Nature which is the jewel of *hayûlâ*, and the images of the universe of bodies become manifest in the *nafs-ar-rahmân* which is the same as Nature.

Yet the fluency of the Divine Breath for the spirits of light (and *â'râd*—effections of any kind, latitudes, mountains, valleys, faces of objects, bodies, accidental qualities, incidental, accidental, casual things etc.), this fluency is latter; in fact the Divine Breath, being fluent in the Absolute Nature which is the spiritual jewel devoid of material *hayûlâ*, brings about the being of the spirits of light, whereas the bringing about of the *â'râd* is through the intermediary of the width of Nature which is the place of manifestation of the *nafs-ar-rahmân*. Consequently, according to the way mentioned, just as Nature takes precedence with its images of intelligence over the images that are existent in it, the Envoy, peace be on him, gave precedence to the women because they are the place of effectedness for images of the perfection of the humankind, upon the manifestation of which depends the Divine knowledge and the Divine manifestness and manifestation. The Envoy, peace be on him, gave priority to women in this news, and gave superiority to the feminine over the masculine, because indeed he meant an act of *himmah* for the women, and he said 'three' in the feminine not three in the masculine, yet the Arabic construction requires the superiority to the masculine over the feminine in grammar (syntax), and it is necessary in Arabic construction to form the sentence in the masculine even if in the sentence there is one masculine word and many feminine words. That is, the Arab does not say: 'Many Fatimahs and Zayd went out (*kharajna*)', but says: 'Zayd and many Fatimahs went out (*kharajû*).' And the Envoy is an Arab, and the most eloquent of the most eloquent of the Arabs, and it would have been necessary that he should construct this phrase with the superiority of the masculine over the feminine, but he did the contrary and submitted to the meaning by which was meant that he was made to love by Divine making to love, and that love was not effected by his *nafs*, and what was aimed at in this being made to love and that love being put in his heart was that women is 'mother' and mother is origin, that is to say, it is the Reality of Realities. Hence the High God instructed the

Envoy, peace be on him, with that thing which the Envoy did not know, that is to say, by causing him to love women made him learn that women were origin and 'mother' and the place of effectedness, and the munificence (*faql*) and God's grace became great. And this great munificence and grace is that by inculcating into him the love of women he became 'ârif of the fact that women is origin and reality.

The Envoy, peace be upon him, made the feminine form prevalent over the masculine form with the word '*thalâtha*'. Now the Envoy is in complete knowledge of the realities and is completely adamant in respecting what is due to realities and gives its due to everything. Equally, he is strongly respectful of what is due to things because he himself is singular and unique in realities. That is why he qualified with the feminine phrase the word 'three', because the origin of all things is 'motherhood' because differentiations come out from the mother. Mother (*umm*) is feminine, and the single *nafs* which is created from it is equally feminine. Equally, the origin of the totality of origins above which there is no higher is referred to as the Reality, and Reality is feminine. The reason for the preponderance of the feminine over the masculine in the words of the Prophet is to pay attention to the femaleness of state, because in them there is resultant meaning of origins in Nature, just as in Reality is resultant the meaning of origin, because Reality which is *umm*, even though It is by meaning *ab* (father) by virtue of meaning because It is the Absolute actor, yet by action It unites in Its Ipseity with acted-upon-ness and thereby is *umm* because in the image of the acted-upon '*ayn* is acted upon, an image in the actor is the actor for '*ayn* because it necessitates the collection through reality of the *ta'ayyun* and the *la ta'ayyun*, and that singular Reality is distinguished in each thing which is distinguished, nonetheless being transcendent by Its Reality from each thing distinguished (*muta'ayyin*), and that is because that singular Reality is distinguished through the First *ta'ayyun*.

That singular '*ayn* necessitates equilibrium and uniformity and levelness between exterior and interior, action and acted-upon-ness, and in each image It is actor by virtue of being the interior, and acted upon by virtue of being the manifest. Reality in every appertenance in whichever face It manifests (appears), for that thing there is resultant action and acted-upon-ness, fatherhood and motherhood. Therefore the feminine is correct and real in reality in the singularity

of 'ayn in the Ipseity in the real Man which is the totality of isthmuseity which is masculine between two feminines. In the *ḥadīth* mentioned, the Envoy, peace be on him, made the ending a primordial nadir (comes from the word *nāẓir*) in rendering it feminine, and between them included the masculine. In other words, he started with the word 'women' and ended with 'prayer' (*ṣalât*), and both women and prayer are feminine, and the perfume between the two is masculine, like the Envoy in being. Because in reality man is included between the Ipseity from which it becomes manifest, and women which is manifest from him, hence man is realized between two feminines, the first one of which is the feminine of the Ipseity, that is to say that the Ipseity (*dhât*) is a feminine word, consequently the first one is a real feminine form as equally is women in feminine form though prayer is not real feminine. Perfume is masculine between the two, like Adam is between the Ipseity (*dhât*) from which it becomes, and Eve which comes from him. Yet Adam, who is between the two females, becomes female through the fact that it becomes manifest from a feminine and the second feminine comes from him. Consequently he is 'mother' (*umm*) and is the origin of totality of realities.

Now if you want you can say that Quality from which man becomes existent is feminine like Ipseity (*dhât*), yet the Ipseity (*dhât*) is transcendent from anything manifesting from It, so if you want you can say that Power (*qudrah*) from whom man became existent, yet *qudrah* is also feminine exactly as the Ipseity and Quality, or if you want to mean like the Ash'arites believe, that Quality and Power are additional to the *dhât* and therefore are intermediary between *dhât* and action, but equally Quality is female. In short, no matter which way you want to be established upon, indeed you will not find any that do not give priority (precedence) to the feminine. Even among the people of causality ('*illah*) whose words are afflicted by causality it is thus, because they consider the *ḥaqq* as cause in the existence of the universe; the fact is that cause ('*illah*) is also feminine. (Those who consider the Being of the *ḥaqq* a cause for the being of the universes are the doctors of science.)

Now what is the wisdom in the Envoy putting the word 'perfume' that he has been made to love, after the women? It is that in women happens the sweet winds of immanence because it is the place of birth and manifestation and accomplishment of action is dependent

upon receptivity and place. This much is necessary that the action of the actor is necessarily attributed more completely than to its attribution to the receptor. Because the attribution is delicate that he referred to it as the sweet wind of immanence, so that there be resultant a connection by virtue of a sweet wind, a zephyr, between women and perfume. Yet he gave priority to women over the male and deferred the masculine perfume by which may be meant issue. In fact the state is such that the best of perfume is the embracing the beloved round the neck, as they have said in some other example. In short, because the perfume is the necessity of women he deferred its mention to after women.

When the Envoy, peace be on him, was created by origin a servant, that is to say, he was effected according to being acted upon for purposes of Divine *taşarruf* and complete submission to perfection and specific servanthood, he did not lift his head once to Lordship, and he did not incline towards Lordship and *taşarruf* in spite of there manifesting in him the Divine active Names of necessarily-so-ness and by virtue of being realized in him the great caliphate, but rather never slipped from the state of being prostrate before the Divine Presence and present at the gates of Lordship, and with specific and total servanthood remained acted upon by the great Lordship, until the High God immanenced from him the totality of immanences. In the universes of breaths which are the sweet-smelling perfumes, God bestowed upon him the rank of activity and effect. In other words, the Envoy, peace be on him, having been individuated by the First *ta'ayyun*, which is the Reality of Realities, that is when he was effected upon by the *la ta'ayyun* and *ghayb-i-muṭlaq* through isthmuseity which is the 'ayn of the 'ayn which combines everything between *ta'ayyun* and non-*ta'ayyun*, as well as reality and creaturality, action and effectedness. Just as being effected upon and individuated from the Being of the Creator at the level of the First Intellect which is the origin of the totality of spiritual and existential *ta'ayyunât*, he arrives into the latterness and thereby becomes equalized to the Divine order in height and determination, equally he is manifest by being realized in original servanthood which is effected upon by the effective active Lordship in the universe of senses and witnessing. Because of the overriding of determinations of possibilities over him, he did not lift his head to Lordship and masterliness. With the High God he did not transgress the rules of good form

(*adab*) and the degrees of limit in servanthood, being prostrate in the Presence of Divinity. Prostrations are limits of humility in response to the completion of grandeur of the *ḥaqq*, and in the station of being effected upon, which is the desert of the possibility and which is by origin its speciality, it is the image of *fanâ'* of the necessities of possibilities in which he was standing and which he knew. In fact, the origin of the possible by its being established in the Divine Knowledge, by virtue of its being established is non-existence, after which it is effectation by virtue of it being brought about from that which is existent. In short, the High God bestowed upon him action and effect because its reality necessitates that. Consequently, action and being effected, the two sides became equalized in him, and the two arcs of necessarily-so-ness and possibility were brought close, and perfect and complete great servanthood and general grand masterliness was bestowed upon him. Thereby, in the universe of breaths he became realized with actorness because he was bestowed with *jawami' kalim*, and they are the realities of letters and the configuration of society of *nufûs*, and the *nufûs* being according to the reality of species and are individuated (*muta'ayyin*) according to the individuations of personalities and being is its effusion, which become immanenced and realized with the sensorial personality and the realities of being, together with the breaths and *nufûs* of the *rahmân* which blows from the realities of the *ghayb*. The zephyrs are the immanencing of the spiritual breaths and *nafs* of *rahmân* and the sweet winds are perfumes, that is why the Prophet, peace be on him, was made to love good-smelling perfume, and he mentioned perfume after women, pointing at the fact that *nafs* in origin is latter by virtue of being breathed. According to this consideration, the Divine *nafs* which is manifest from 'mother' (*umm*) which is called Mother of the Book, with that Divine *nafs* through the realities of the letters and words of the Mother Book, expired. In other words, from the constriction of non-existence ('*adam*') first brought them out into the width of the Divine Knowledge and then manifested them to the universe of witnessing, which is the beginning, invention, of the universes, so they manifested with that *nafs*. The Divine *nafs* is that which is preceded by to that is enlarged, breathed out and became *nafsed* by it. Mother, which is *nafsed*, is origin and *nafs* is detail.

To the Envoy, peace be on him, perfume was made lovable from God. This is why the Envoy, in mentioning the perfume, mentioned it

after women, because *nafs* is subject to that which is breathed which is mother and origin. Consequently, perfume is subject to women. In this *ḥadīth* the Envoy respected the Divine degrees, which degrees are established for Its reality, as in the quote: 'He is the elevated in degrees', which He encompasses by His Name the *rahmân*. It is to respect these degrees which are established for the *ḥaqq* in these words 'elevated in degrees' that the Envoy mentioned perfume after women, respecting thus the degree which is breathed which is the Divine Name, which degree encompasses, spreads over, the Throne ('*arsh*) through the Name of *rahmân*, and it is because the High God encompassed the Throne through the Name of *rahmân* that He was qualified by the Name *dhul 'arsh* (that of the Throne). The Shaykh, God be pleased with him, with his words: '*Farâ'â ad-darajât al-lati lil ḥaqq*', points at that in the precedence of women to delaying of the perfume that he respected the arrangement of the totality of the Divine degrees and steps of being, from the degree of the Intellect, which is the first of the degrees of being, which ends with the degree of the human body, which is the last of the degrees of being. The first existent is the First Intellect, which is called the real Adam. After that, Total *nafs*, from which the totality of the *nafs-i-nâṭiqā* becomes existent. Total *nafs* is equal to Eve, through whose intermediary, action and being effected becomes manifest in things. What comes after is *hayûlâ* of bodies. After that is the Total Body. After that is *falak-al-atlas* which is the most munificent Throne. After that is the Chair, and these are degrees of Nature. After these the genuses which are from the heavens and the earth. After this are the triple births. After this are the angels. After that are degrees of the jinn, and after that is the degree of man. After all the Divine degrees mentioned and all the degrees of the Divine Intellect of the being of the *rahmân*, Total *nafs* became precedent over all the other degrees, and all these other degrees became detailed out from it. The High *ḥaqq* having descended from the degree of the First Intellect, which is the first degree of being, to the degree of bodies, which is the last degree of being, the overall covering of *rahmân* happened. The last degree of Divine Perfect Man-ness is the degree of Mohammed, where the Throne revealed in the images of the totality of Divinity upon the heart of Mohammed and encompassed it. The heart of Mohammed is the Divine Throne ('*arsh*) and encompasses all the totality of the degrees of the universe, revealing itself from the place

of manifestation of Mohammed, and his being became *rahmah* for the universes.

In all that the Compassionate Throne (*'arsh rahmânî*) encompasses, there is not a thing left which has not met with Divine *rahmah*, and in the Divine saying: 'And My *rahmah* expanded over everything' it is made clear that the *rahmah* meets everything that the Throne encompasses. Hence the '*arsh rahmânî* has expanded to everything and the Name prevalent over the Throne is *rahmân*, and the fluence of *rahmah* in the universe happens through the reality of the '*arsh* or through the total reality of the Name *rahmân* which is prevalent over the '*arsh*. Just as we have declared in this book and except in one subject in several subjects and several times in the 'Meccan Opening'. Now it is manifest that the Name *rahmân*'s total *rahmâh* which is prevalent over the '*arsh* has met all the existents which are encompassed by the bodily '*arsh* (*'arsh jismânî*), and in the totality of the universes, in its reality, its *rahmah* is fluent, because the '*arsh* extends over all things which are under its determination (*ḥukm*), because the High *ḥaqq* says: 'And My *rahmah* extends over everything.' In the *ta'ayyun awwal*, which is the Divine '*arsh*, with the *nafs-i-rahmânî* of the *ghayb*, the receptive *a'yân* of possibilities together with the Divine Names which are the yet inexistent things, have been differentiated, because in the *ta'ayyun awwal*, which is the '*arsh* of the non-*ta'ayyun* and the Absolute *ghayb*, the total and complete and general *rahmah* is prevalent over the totality of the things which is under its encompassing, which has taken them out into the plains of the Divine Knowledge from the constriction of non-existence. Equally, the '*arsh* of the Prime Intellect which encompasses the totality of the spiritual and bodily realities which is spiritual and *rahmânî* '*arsh* and the Name *rahmân* which encompasses this is expanded over the totality of things of the spiritual and bodily reality which is under its encompassing which extends over all this. Even the bodily '*arsh* (*'arsh jismânî*) is a thing from among these things. The reality of the Name of *rahmân* which is prevalent over the '*arsh* is this that differentiates the Name *rahmân* from other Names. And upon the totality of the realities of species and varieties and personalities which are the realities of the universe which are under it, it bestows the fluency of the *ḥaqq*. After this the Shaykh returns to the remainder of the wisdom of the *ḥadîth*.

Indeed the High *ḥaqq* in the marital soldering which happens between man and woman and wherein happens the perfume, used it where it concerned the absolution of 'Aishah, may God be pleased with her, in this Quranic passage. He said: 'The wicked women are for wicked men, and wicked men are for wicked people. Good sweet-smelling women are for good sweet-smelling men, and good sweet-smelling men are for the good sweet-smelling women.' It is without a doubt that the Envoy in this soldering by marriage is of the best of the best (and sweet-smelling people), and in this soldering that which is particular to him is 'Aishah and the other wives of the *nabiyy* which are of the best of the best sweet-smelling people. Thus the High God gave witness concerning 'Aishah that she was a good (sweet-smelling) person because she is particular to the good (sweet-smelling) person which is the Envoy, and denied wickedness from her by the words that the wicked women were for wicked men and wicked men were for wicked women. Since she was a wife of the Envoy and the Envoy is of the most *ṭayyib* of all the *ṭayyib* people, and by the words: 'And they are absolved from what people say', reiterated the denial of wickedness from them, which means that the wives of the *nabiyy* are all absolved from the words of the oppressors. And this Quranic verse concerns the absolution of 'Aishah. The adding on of the other wives in this is because if it were to be interpreted only with the absolution of 'Aishah, it would be necessary to imagine the non-absolution of the other wives. That is why the verset was in the plural form. And the reason why the mentioning of all this in the masculine plural is that the Envoy is the most complete of the individuals of the humankind because he is the most *ṭayyib* (good and good-scented) and *ṭayyib* is *kâmil*, hence the *ṭayyib* women which are particular to the *ṭayyib* man, being completion in the degrees of men, the mention was made through masculine plural (which means that women are necessary to man for their becoming complete (*kâmil*) Man).

The High *ḥaqq* considered the sweet-smelling breeze of the *ṭayyib* people as perfume, because indeed speech is breath and breath is the same as sweet-smelling breeze. But breath can come out with *ṭayyib* or may come out with wickedness concerning a thing according to which speech manifests with the breath. That is to say, He made of the sweet breeze of the good a perfume, because speech is human breath and is by virtue of its place and source manifest and their

ipseity is *ṭayyib*, and their words which are their breaths is equally *ṭayyib*, and this is how the breath is the same as the sweet-smelling breeze. Breath which becomes *muta'ayyin* in the heart which is the beginning of the human *nafṣ*, and having passed into all the degrees from the sources of letters, at the level of speech by virtue of the state of the breath at the level of speech which is the source of the letter *waw*, having become *muta'ayyin* at that level, manifests with a sweet breeze in the image of the speech with the quality which is bestowed upon it by the *ṭayyib* ipseity of the *ṭayyib* people. In other words, the breath, at the level of speech, becomes permeated by the sweet breeze that the state of the breather has bestowed on it. And breath (*nafas*) becomes the same as the sweet-smelling breeze, because the *nafas* has expired through the *ṭayyib* by virtue of the state of the breather in the image of speech. If the place is *ṭayyib*, equally *nafas* is *ṭayyib*. Consequently, its sweet-smelling breeze is equally *ṭayyib* because its origin is *ṭayyib*, and nothing other than *ṭayyib* emanates from the *ṭayyib*. However, if the place is wicked, the breath is equally wicked and emanates in wickedness, ('And he who is wicked, nothing emerges from him except sinister words'). *Ṭayyib* (good, sweet-smelling scent, sweet-smelling air) and *khabiṭh* (wicked) are two opposing (*mutaqābilātan*) adjectives. They are accidents for the breath by virtue of place. The *anfus* (breaths, *nufūs*) are in reality Divine order and *nafṣ-ar-raḥmān*. By virtue of this, they are essentially *ṭayyib*. They emerge from the origin by original cleanliness (*tahārah*) and beauty and subtlety (*latāfah*), and yet by virtue of a wicked place there results for it a wicked form whence the breath manifests in the image of speech with that wicked form. It is equally so on the contrary for the *ṭayyib* breath by virtue of the *ṭayyib* place, where a *ṭayyib* form results and the *ṭayyib* breath becomes most *ṭayyib*, just as sweet water through its running through a channel which is in a sweet place is sweet. However, as *nafas* by origin, by virtue of its being Divine *nafas*, is *ṭayyib* in totality, whether it comes by virtue of a place as *ṭayyib* or as *khabiṭh*, yet breath (*nafas*) by virtue of its origin is *ṭayyib*, and it becomes by virtue of place either *maḥmūd* or *madhmûm*; consequently it is *ṭayyib* by consideration of its *ṭayyib* place or *khabiṭh* by consideration of the *khabiṭh* place. Consequently, *madḥ* (praise) or *dhamm* (blame) over the *nafas* at the level of speech is by virtue of the *ṭayyib* form or the *khabiṭh* form. That is why *nafas* is relegated to speech, because in the

majority of people, in relation to the breath, unless it has breathed through speech it is not manifest whether his breath is *ṭayyib* or *khabîth*. According to this consideration, even the non-speaking sleeper's *nafas* emanates either as *ṭayyib* or *khabîth*, yet at the level of speech this is more apparent. Concerning garlic the Envoy said: 'This is a plant whose scent is unpleasant to me', but he did not say: 'It is a plant which I find unpleasant', because the 'ayn of the plant cannot be considered unpleasant because 'ayn is *ḥaqq*. It is the Divine face which is *muta'ayyin* by the Divine *nafas*, but perhaps that which emanates from that which is breath which can be considered as unpleasant, and breeze is an accident over the 'ayn. Therefore, breeze can be *ṭayyib* or *khabîth*. (In certain true copies it comes out as: the 'ayn is not unpleasant, and if there is unpleasantness what is unpleasant is what manifests from it. What is meant by 'ayn here is the reality of the garlic and its 'ayn-i-thâbita. Consequently, it is not the 'ayn-i-thâbita or the reality of the garlic which can be called unpleasant. Its breath is made unpleasant and the breeze from it is unpleasant, the breath which is manifest from it which is affected by virtue of place; the breath itself cannot be considered as unpleasant because it is *nafas raḥmânî*, but when the breeze is affected by what the place of the *nafs* of the garlic endows it with and it appears as a breeze, it is that breeze which can be considered unpleasant, and in other copies it is given as: '. . . but the breeze of it is unpleasant.')

Now let it be known like this, when the Envoy (peace be with him) said: 'I dislike its scent', he connected the objectionability of the scent to his *nafs*, and this objectionability became a related order only to himself and not necessarily objectionable to others. Here the Shaykh (may God be pleased with him) explains the reason for objectionability in a thing, and says that a thing which emanates from a source is objectionable by relationship to some people and not to others. For instance, a custom in one nation may be objectionable to another nation, and something might be suitable to the nature of one person and not to another, like honey, sugar or milk, which may not be suitable to other natures, or like the hearing of a nice word concerning somebody may not be suitable to the purpose of someone, or the opposite to the other, or something may not be suitable according to the laws of one religion and might be to the other, or it might be unsuitable because it is diminished from the completion which is

required of a thing, (such as) like a nice-smelling something stops smelling nice and then it is diminished from its perfection, then it becomes objectionable, and other than these things which we have mentioned, meaning these relationships, there is not anything in existence of objectionability. Hence something is in one way appreciated and in another way considered undesirable. In one relationship it may be well, and in another relationship it may be considered bad.

When the order of being was divided into good and bad, the Prophet was made to like what was good and was not made to like what was not good, because what was good was according to his nature which inclined to good, and the goodness of women is of the necessities of goodness and good women are created from his good nature and are parts of him. The Envoy described the angels which really suffer from bad smells, because in the emergence of this genus there is decomposition present because man is really made of putrefying mud which is wet mud, that kind of putrefied mud which is miasmatic. He is created from a dry mud which comes from black mud which comes from miasmatic acid mud, and the angels find it very disagreeable, the putrefying smell in this emergence, because the natures of the angels which are of the emergence of light and spirit, and their good and clean personalities, are contrary to the smells of putrefaction and things in this emergence. And because of the relationship there is that exists with the angels it is absolutely necessary to be clean of body and clothes, and the continuing in ablution and nice smells are absolutely necessary. The Shaykh gives these examples because good and bad are, like he has explained, orders of relationship. The nature of the dung-beetle becomes disturbed and suffers and hates the smell of the rose. Whereas the smell of the rose is of good smells, yet at the level of the dung-beetle the scent of the rose is not of good smells, and the relation of this good smell with the dung-beetle in relative order becomes disagreeable. If there is a person who in image or meaning is like the dung-beetle and in that sort of a nature, truth (reality) would disturb him and he would be upset if he heard the truth, and would be happy with wrong, and these sort of people is what God refers to when He says: 'Those who believe in the *bâtîl* and went into *kufr* by God', because they are coverers-up of the truth (*kâfir*) when it concerns God. They are the believers in *bâtîl*, and these are the ones that God qualified by saying that they are in error (*husran*). That is to say, by their inclination to

the bad they believed in the wrong and were happy there and were coverers-up of the *ḥaqq* because they suffered by it, and these are the ones who are in error because they erred and squandered their *nafs* by denying the *ḥaqq* and by affirming the wrong. If a man does not differentiate between the good and bad and in the degrees does not differentiate between truth and wrong, then he has no comprehension in matters of truth and is not distinguishable from the degrees of insects. Now, the Divine realities and the knowledges of Lordship descend upon the hearts of the complete people of God with Divine exhalation and breathings (*nafas*) of the *rahmân*, so that the spirits of those who are on the Way and the hearts of the students of the Way find life from the good airs (smells) of the *rahmân*, and when they are heard by the doctors of law and philosophers and fanatical people who have remained at the level of the effects of the lower *awhâm*, these people deny the veracity of what comes to their ears, and they mock them and accuse them and call them *zindîq*, yet these mysteries are no other than the words of Truth and Reality, descending from the original Purity and degrees of Divinity and the Presences of the Names, descending according to the Way of Mohammed and Divine *dhawq*.

The Envoy was made to love what was good in everything, but the truth is that there is nothing but good in existence and there is nothing in existence where goodness is not its reality, and that which manifests in that thing is the Face of the *ḥaqq*, and in the Presence of Mohammed, that is to say, in his vision which looks upon things as they really are, there is nothing but good, because the character and inclination of the Envoy is according to the most honourable and best composition, and his nature is of the most just, and his spirit is of the light of the jewel of the purest kind, and that is why he has love for all things which are good. Now in reality, at the level of the manifestation of reality, it is not allowed that the non-good be removed totally from the *a'yân* of the universes, and he says: Is it possible at all to imagine that there is such a nature in the universe that does not see anything except the good in everything and does not know of the bad, or is it not possible to imagine? Now, we answer that this does not exist, because we have not seen this in that origin from which the universe manifested, and that origin is the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, we have not seen the *ḥaqq* that has differentiated the wrong from the universe but we saw it as seeing things objectionable and seeing

things lovable. Yet it is so that where the character is deviated from the true balance and the approved character is lost, in fact some of the people who have deviated characters, smells musk in everything and does not differentiate between different smells; then he is devoid of balance and there is no difference between this man who has deviated from balance and the man who likes the smell of smoke and putrefaction, and there is no difference between them in differentiation and comprehension of differentiation.

Man is according to two images. One is according to the image of the *ḥaqq* and the other is according to the image of the universe, and in the universe you will not find a single character who will understand only one order of things, that is to say, only the good or only the bad. But you will find in the universe a kind of character who will understand the good from the bad, or that while he knows the bad and that he is with taste for the bad and without good taste, that is to say, a man who is by taste a character whose taste is for the bad, or the contrary, a man who will see by vision or smell that which is good and will understand it and because of his taste will not look at its badness, and he is occupied with the goodness of that thing and overlooks the badness of that thing. This kind of nature is rare in nature, but to elevate (remove) altogether the bad from the universe, that is, from the immanence, is not true, and it is not true (acceptable) to remove all the bad from the universe and to understand only the good in everything, because natures are variegated and the good is that which is lenient to the character and inclination of the person who understands, and by degrees that is against his character and nature that thing becomes bad and the bad is not according to the nature and character of a person, and by relative degrees of opposition to his nature and character things become good. Consequently, good and bad are two relative orders of comprehension. The removal of the bad from the immanence is not true by virtue of the fact that natures are differentiated, and by virtue of the images of opposing Names effective in the universe. But from the point of consideration of the relationship of the *a'yân* to the things, and by virtue of the reality of things as they really are, that which is *muta'ayyin* in everything through the Being of the *ḥaqq*, there is not a thing in the universe which is bad. And the consideration that certain orders are, at the level of the *ḥaqq*, some are good and some are bad, is because of that thing, or the devolution of the *ḥaqq* in one degree from one of

the *ḥaqq*'s degrees, that he sees of that thing or for that thing as good because it is suitable in form, in quality and praise to that degree in comparison with things that complicate it at that degree, or he sees a thing as objectionable because it is by its being short of state for that degree, or non-beneficial to that degree, which in another relationship and another degree is good. But all the orders, because of what they really are, for God and at the level of God and at the level of Himself, are all good, and this is also good at the level of the total *'ârîf*. And if by virtue of state or degree in the senses there is something not good, the Perfect Man's occupation with the good of it prevents him from his consideration of the badness of that thing. However, by connection of relationship, the *rahmah* of God is fluent both in the bad and the good, and God's *rahmah* is fluent in everything, and everything is by virtue of connection and relationship good and bad, and the thing that is bad at the level of its own *nafs* is good, and that which is good at that level is bad. That is, in the immanence there is nothing which is good except that this same thing is in one way bad for one of the characters and inclinations; for that private character it is good. Consequently, according to the different characters and relative to them, there is not a thing in the universe which is not in one way bad and in another way good.

But in the above-mentioned *ḥadîth*, the third order in the word 'three' through which the singularity became (complete and) perfect is prayer. In other words, the Envoy completed the singularity through (with) prayer. Now when he did this, he mentioned it with the words: '. . . the prayer being the pupil of the eye', and he perfected and completed the singularity with these words, because in reality prayer is vision, and to explain how prayer is vision it is as follows. In reality prayer is pleading between God and the servant. God addressed His servant and said: 'Mention Me, and I shall mention you.' In other words: 'When you are in prayer, mention Me. When you are in prayer, specialize praise (*ḥamd*) to Me and be qualified with praising Me so that I mention you with that same qualification.' When the servant in prayer mentions the *ḥaqq* with the words: '*Al-ḥamdu lillâh*', then the *ḥaqq* mentions him with the words of his *ḥamd*. That is, in the prayer (*ṣalât*) He answers him. When the servant mentions the *ḥaqq* in his prayer, the *ḥaqq* becomes his companion: 'I am the companion of he who mentions Me', and the companion of a thing is in the vision of that thing. In the same way, for

the servant to address God in prayer and for God to address the servant, it is a supplication, and supplication happens at the level of vision, and prayer is vision of the *ḥaqq*. God made prayer the same as vision because what is intended by prayer is supplication (*munâjât*) between the *ḥaqq* and the servant, and supplication is only possible during vision, and if the one who prays does not reach the station of vision during supplication, in reality he is not praying. Hence the reality of prayer is vision (*shuhûd*). And when God says: 'And they are continuous in prayer'. He explains this meaning (He means this), and because prayer (*ṣalât*) is vision that for the Envoy prayer was made the pupil of the eye, because the pupil of the eye in the Beloved is possible through vision of the Beloved.

Prayer is divided adoration between a God and the servant according to two halves. One half of the prayer is particular to God, and the other half is particular to the servant, just as in the veridic *ḥadîth* God said: 'Indeed I made prayer divided into two parts between Myself and My servant. Half of it is particular to Me and half is special to My servant, and for My servant results that which he does.' The servant says: '*Bismi-llâhi-r rahmâni-r rahîm*', and God says: 'My servant has mentioned Me.' The servant says: '*Al-ḥamdu lillâhi rabbi-l 'âlamîn*', and God says: 'My servant has praised Me.' The servant says: '*Ar rahmâni-r rahîm*', and God says: 'My servant lauds Me.' The servant says: '*Maliki yawmi-d dîn*', and God says: 'My servant has glorified Me. My servant has given over his order to Me.' All this half is particular to God. That is to say, all these qualifications coming from the servant are particular to God, and the servant is not qualified with these. And this half is called *shaṭr-i-wujûb* (the half of necessarily-so-ness, the necessarily-so-ness half). Then the servant said: '*Iyyâka na'budu wa iyyâka nasta'in*', and God says: 'This is between Me and My servant, and what My servant desired happened.' And this moment shows that God associates with the servant. This verset is an isthmus, includes both sides. In the words: '*Iyyâka na'budu*' there is adoration from the side of the servant and establishes God as the object adored, and in the words: '*wa iyyâka nasta'in*' is from God to the servant help, because help is particular to the *ḥaqq*. Then the servant says the rest of the prayer, and God says: 'These qualifications are particular to My servant, and from My servant has resulted that which he has asked for.' Like He has particularized the first part of the prayer for Himself, the second

half was particularized for the servant and this half is known as the *shaṭr-i-imkān* (the half of possibilities). It is from this *ḥadīth* that it came to be known that the reading of the *Fātiḥa* became a thing of necessity. If a person in prayer does not read the *Fātiḥa*, he does not perform the prayer which is divided into two parts. Let it be known like this, that it is God who made the division of the *Fātiḥa* into two parts the same as division into two parts of the prayer, with the words '*qasamat ṣalāt*'. Because the *Fātiḥa* is the greatest part of prayer, it is perhaps the same as the prayer (*ṣalāt*), because the shape of the *Fātiḥa* in prayer is what is aimed at as shape, especially as when according to custom one starts the prayer. The Envoy said in a *ḥadīth*: 'There is no prayer without the *Fātiḥa* of the Book', and from this it came to be known that the *Basmalah* (*Bismi-llāhi-r raḥmāni-r raḥīm*) is the greater part of the *Fātiḥa*, and God made the words: '*Bismi-llāhi-r raḥmāni-r raḥīm*' a part of the prayer. God explained that original singularity which was made particular to Mohammed, which means the trinity, in the *Fātiḥa*, because one portion is particular to God, the last portion is particular to the servant, and in between them is the isthmus which is between the *ḥaqq* and the servant. That is why God made the *Fātiḥa* as a particular bestowal to Mohammed from among the prophets. There is the *ḥadīth* which explains that the prayer is vision. That is, as the prayer is supplication and prayer is mention, and if somebody mentions the *ḥaqq* then in reality he is companion to the *ḥaqq*, and the *ḥaqq* becomes his companion, and he becomes the companion to the *ḥaqq*. And this is from what God has made known, that He is in effect the companion of the person who mentions Him, and if that man has vision he must see his companion. That is to say, he must see his companion who is God. Consequently, prayer (*ṣalāt*) is vision and seeing, but if the one who mentions is not a man of vision, he cannot observe the *ḥaqq* and he is not the owner of the pupil of the eye in prayer; and he becomes cognizant of his degree in prayer and his station through whether he sees and observes God in prayer or not, and he will see by looking at his state in prayer whether he has reached the degree of vision of God in prayer or not. If he does not see the *ḥaqq* in prayer, then let him continue with the belief of the unknown, that is, let him pray to God as if he saw Him, through imagination and conjecture (pray to God as if you saw Him). In short, let the man in prayer, during his prayer and supplication, imagine God in his niche of prayer and conjecture Him,

and also, equally, the hearing of Him from the place of manifestation of that imagined image, that Divine word with which the *ḥaqq* will answer him, because by virtue of each word of the man in prayer the *ḥaqq* addresses him and answers him in the prayer. In fact, in the mentioned *ḥadīth* this has come to pass, and it is possible to say that the word to answer is: let it be light (*khafif*) and lend sound to what is arriving from that imagined God so that God through that will answer him, if the man who is praying is the leader in his private universe. That is to say, the universe of being which is private to him, which is his body, his spirit, his interior, his exterior, his surrounding, his limbs, his *nafs* his heart, and the totality of his spiritual and sensible powers and the individuals of the powers of senses, all of which his being contains, if he is a leader in prayer to this and also to the angels who will be praying with him during his prayer, this will happen.

Now what is meant by private universe is man's own universe of existence, and some have conjectured that what was meant by leadership (*imām*) was to become a leader to man, but the words 'private universe' refutes the possibility of such a conjecture, because the degrees of leadership which are brought down happens in the private universe of man, and since this order becomes established, the leadership of man becomes established in a higher way. Indeed each man in prayer is without a doubt a leader (*imām*), because indeed the angels follow the servant in his prayer and this is so even when he is alone in prayer. Indeed during prayer, for each person who prays, there results the degree of envoyship (*rasūl*), and the degree of envoyship is acting as substitute for God, because the leadership of the envoy is the presence of God's servants in their own right. Consequently, the leader (*imām*) is the caliph of God only when he is at prayer, and the totality of his powers and his surroundings, equally the protective angels, all follow him, and he is present there with the rights of all of them. Being a leader (*imām*) to a collectivity of man is equally in this manner. In short, during prayer the degree of envoyship happens for the leader (*imām*), especially when he has finished the bowing (*rak'ah*), and especially at the moment of having heard (of hearing) the praise and gratitude of all those that follow him, he says: 'God has heard those that give Him praise and gratitude' (*sami' Allāh liman ḥamida*), which means that God hears the praise and gratitude of those who praise Him through the quality of 'Hearer'

(*samî*), and in other words, this to his own *nafs*, which is his powers and his surroundings and his limbs and members, together with the angels that are behind him and follow him, that is, if he is praying alone. But if he is praying with a collectivity of people he informs that God hears the praise and gratitude of those who give praise and gratitude, not only his own *nafs* and the angels that follow him, but to the collectivity of people that he is with. Just as the High God says with the tongue of His servant that God has heard the praise and gratitude of those who give praise and gratitude, the leader with the same words announces that God has heard their praise and gratitude, and becomes established in the degree of substitution to God. And this is because although it is God who speaks with the tongue of the servant, for the considerations of the outward aspect (*zâhir*) the servant, by virtue of his caliphate (*khilâfah*), is able to pronounce the words: 'God has heard the praise and gratitude of those who praise Him and give Him gratitude' (*samî* *Allâh liman ḥamida*). The angels and the leader (*imâm*) and all that follow him of people, and his own limbs and powers, all that is in the collectivity that pray behind him say: 'Our Lord, our praise and grace-giving is to You' (*rabbânâ wa laka ḥamd*). Thus their words: 'Our Lord, our praise and gratitude is to You alone', becomes the answer to God's words which say: 'God has heard those who give Him praise and gratitude.' As indeed God has said this with the tongue of His servant, the one who says it is indeed God Himself.

Look now at the high degree of prayer (*ṣalât*) and how he who is in prayer reaches what high place and to what degree prayer makes him arrive! That degree is the degree of caliphate and being a substitute for God, from God. But if the person who is praying has not reached the grade of seeing God, then he has not reached the degree of being the substitute and has not reached the aim of prayer, and the condition of becoming the 'light (delight, consolation) of the eyes' has not happened for him, because he has not seen God in fact when he was at prayer. Consequently, if a person who is in prayer does not hear God's address through which God answers him, (he) is not of the kind of those who pray to God who give sound to God's address, and if a person in prayer at the level of seeing God and at the level of hearing the word of God and thus not reaching the degree of presence of his Lord, that person in prayer is certainly not in prayer even if he is a witness. This means that he has not attained the degree of

attributing hearing to the word of God which is the aim of the degree of the delight (consolation) of the pupil of the eye which is the witnessing of God. Now, let it be known like this then, that seeing, hearing and witnessing of God in a servant at prayer, happens through the strength of belief and *yaqîn*, and it even is that the collectivity of the *yaqîn* becomes the same as his comprehension, his vision and his hearing. And it sometimes happens that the heart with the light of vision and understanding, that is to say he sees with the light of revelation of the Divine Qualities which are revealed to the heart, and it sometimes happens that seeing God happens through the sight of the eye. That is to say, the *haqq* assumes a similitude (*mutamâthil*) and being revealed becomes witnessed by him, and divides the prayer between Himself and His servant. The *haqq* who divides the prayer between Himself and His servant is the *haqq* who is believed in according to the beliefs, and it is not the Absolute *haqq*. God collects all these faces in His perfect and singular servant; there he observes the *haqq* in all faces. There is no other kind of worship from among all sorts of worship in which the worshipper is not allowed to have any other occupation other than the *ṣalât*, the prayer itself, while he is at this worship, because *ṣalât* is supplication (*munâjât*) to God and it is absolutely forbidden to give attention to anything else. That is to say, to give attention to anything else prevents him from the vision of God, but other worships are not like the *ṣalât*. The biggest and the greatest of words and acts which is included in the *ṣalât* is the *dhikr* of God which is related to the heart and the tongue. In fact, we have mentioned the qualities of the Perfect Man during *ṣalât* in the *Futûḥât al-Makkiyyah*, to show in what way the *ṣalât* happens. That is to say, this sort of *ṣalât* which is established according to presence and witnessing, prevents the worshipper from things which are abominations and which are detestable. In fact, God has established it for the person who is at worship while he is at worship, and he is called the worshipper during that time that he pays no attention to any other affair except this worship, whether this other thing be another worship, or whatever other thing it may be.

But the fact is that the *dhikr* of God in the *ṣalât* is bigger. That is that *dhikr* which happens from God for His servant at the moment when the High God answers His servant in response to His servant's demand, and God's praise of His servant is bigger than the servant's *dhikr* of his Lord in the *ṣalât* because grandeur is particular to God.

In other words, in the *ṣalât*, God's *dhikr* for the servant is bigger than the servant's *dhikr* of God because grandeur is particular to God. And *dhikr* is a quality of the one who does the *dhikr* by virtue of he being the maker of the *dhikr*. Consequently, *dhikr* made by God is bigger, and this is to point at the fact that in the *ṣalât* in the place of manifestation of the complete servant where the *dhikr* of God happens, where (when) the High God memorates His own *nafs* with the tongue of His servant and gives *ḥamd* to His own *nafs*, this is bigger than when the servant with the tongue of the *ḥaqq* makes the *dhikr*. The former is the *dhikr* of obligation, the second is the *dhikr* of supererogatory. And further, that which happens during the *ṣalât* of giving hearing to God's address is because God does the *dhikr* for His servant during the *ṣalât*. Consequently, the *dhikr* of God is the greatest, and its predication is grandest, because what causes the servant to *dhikr* the *ḥaqq*, and the servant's giving sound to the address of God in response to the servant's demand during the *ṣalât*, is caused by God's *dhikr*. In other words, that which happens in the *ṣalât* is of those mysteries which, by virtue of those mysteries, caused the *ṣalât* to be loved by the Envoy. In fact, when the existence of the universe happened through a movement of mentation, which was the movement of love, that movement transported the universe from the established non-being to the qualified being, and *ṣalât* became common to all movement, and the movement of the universe is three. The first movement is the straight movement, and that movement is the state of standing erect during the *ṣalât* of the one who is doing the prayer. Another is the horizontal movement, and that is the bending at a right angle of the body (*rak'ah*) during the *ṣalât*, and the third is the inverted position (*mankûsa*), which is the position of the one who prays of prostrating himself during the *ṣalât*. Further, the movement of man is erect, the movement of animals is horizontal and the movement of the plants is invertible, whereas for the solids, like stones, minerals and things, there is no movement through their own self, just as a stone is only in movement if somebody else moves it, and it does not move of its own accord.

Now let it be known like this, that the movement of the Intellect (mentation) which brings out the existence of the immanence to the existence of witnessing from the non-existence of the *ghayb*, is according to three kinds. The first is for the bringing about of the lower (*sufli*) universe, which is the movement of descent and hanging

down from above. This movement is the inverted position (*mankûsa*), like the letter *alif*, the movement of which is top towards the bottom. And the other kind is the movement from the bottom up, and this movement is the straight movement for the universes of the Divine Names and Lordly relationships, like the movement of the *alif* from down up when it is connected to another letter, because the common names become existent with the existence of the immanence and in (with) this is included the movement of ascension (*mi'râj*) for the bringing into existence of spirits and *anfus*. And the third one is in neither of the two directions which are the top and the bottom, but rather for the movement at the horizon which is for the bringing into existence of the universe of collectivity of man between the two directions, and this movement is the horizontal movement; and this trinity and the triple movement is in the *ṣalât* which is private to the *ḥaqq*, which is brought into existence through revelation. In the same way, the movement of the universe which is manifest from the degree of solids is equally of three kinds of movement, the first one of which is the inverted movement which is the movement of the plants and vegetable kingdom, and one part is horizontal which is the movement of the animals, and one part is straight which is the movement of man. Hence, the universe is manifest through three movements, which finds straightness with the man, like the *ṣalât* of the one who prays is complete and resultant from triple movements, one of which is his standing up which is the state of straightness, the other is his *rak'ah*, and the third is his state of prostration. Thus, for the servant there happened during the *ṣalât*, which is no other than reaching and connecting (*irtibât*) to God, singularity and trinity in his heart through the three movements, which are standing up, *rak'ah* and prostration. This trinity appertains to the act of the servant; the trinity which is in his words is the trinity in the *ṣalât* which happens through (in) the trinity of the *Fâtiḥa* (the first verset of the Quran). In short, the singularity of Mohammed which is resultant through trinity happens with many of its aspects in the *ṣalât* and becomes realized in many kinds of *ṣalât*. This is why *ṣalât* was made to be loved by the Envoy.

Now let it be known like this, that what the Shaykh (God be pleased with him) meant by saying that the movement of man is straight, the movement of the animal horizontal and the movement of the vegetation is inverted, is this: he did not mean that it is always

and exclusively and absolutely that the man's movement is straight and the animal's movement is horizontal and the vegetation's movement is inverted, but in certain aspects. The knowledgeable people concerned with this matter agreed on that aspect. The Shaykh in his *Futûḥât* says that the movement in the vegetable kingdom is according to three different parts, because the head of the plant demands movement, and whichever direction that its head turns, it is related to that direction, and if it faces another direction it becomes inverted. After this the knowledgeable people have considered directions in the body of man and considered the direction of his emergence and his head, and considered straightness in his movement and called his movement with the name 'straight', and said the man's movement is a straight movement, and that each plant moves in the direction of its head. Yet movement which faces an opposite direction to the man's movement, according to his direction or his area of dwelling, his conduct, then that movement would be inverted, and that movement is that of the trees. And if between the straight movement and the inverted movement a person who is in opposition with the movement of his head and in movement towards the horizon, his movement is horizontal.

Those vegetations which have no sense but have growth, their total movement is inverted, and that vegetation which has senses is according to two parts. One part is the straight movement like man, and one part is horizontal like animals. Between man and animals there are certain connectors who are first primarily man and lastly animals, but they are not empowered by the power of man and they are not, on the other hand, remaining according to the determination of animals, like the apes or monkeys. In the same way there is an intermediary between animal and plant, like the date-palm, and equally between plants and minerals there is an intermediary, like casualties (mental derangements) (*lammah*). In short, the movement of the plants is inverted, and like we have said, the scientist has said that the plant's movement is inverted movement, but they have not satisfied and accomplished what vision requires, the deserts of vision. At our level the movement of the plant is straight because the plant does not move except for growing, and man and animal equally do not move with the movement for growing except by being a plant, and one does not say concerning the plant that it is varied of movement by virtue of its being a plant, but rather its movement is varied

if it is resultant from other than the necessity of growing, like the movement in directions, but the movement which happens as further movements in the bodies is because it is the body of a plant, whether that movement be in the animal or in any other thing. In short, that movement is one movement which is the movement which happens from the original seed, which that body becomes manifest by the movement of growing from that seed. Consequently, all bodies become enlarged (widened, expanded, ample) in every direction according to the degree that is granted of aid (help, assistance, reinforcement, goal) to it. Thus it sometimes happens that its movement towards the right gives it a growth which is much smaller of growing movement towards up. Other directions are the same as this. The reason why one mentions these words of the Shaykh here, in short, is this, that according to certain faces that he mentions in the book, and (when) according to the majority of people, it is according to what the doctors of science have said, but at the level of the Shaykh himself it is not like this. All the three movements mentioned are all straight, even the roots of the seed which face towards below the seed, and lower which is the way of the trees, even their movement is straight movement. Then how can it be that the movement of the trees which are on the surface of the earth cannot be of straight movement?

When the Prophet said that: 'The *ṣalât* was brought to me as the pupil of the eye', he did not ascribe the bringing about to himself but related it to God, because in reality the revelation of the *ḥaqq* to the one who is praying refers to God and does not refer to the one who is doing the prayer, because the light of the eye (*qurrah-al-'ayn*) of the one who is praying is the witnessing of the *ḥaqq*, and the witnessing of the *ḥaqq* and the revelation of the *ḥaqq* refers to the *ḥaqq* and is not brought about by the servant. The revelation that is brought to the one who prays is aspiration to the *ḥaqq*. In fact in reality, if God had not mentioned it to the Envoy from His own qualification from His own Self, certainly God would have ordered the Envoy to prayer without revelation to the Envoy from Himself. Therefore the Envoy's words: 'In prayer the light of my eyes was brought to me', means that the saying was from God to the Envoy: 'I brought the light of your eyes to you in prayer.' That is to say, if the *ḥaqq* from His own *nafs* had not mentioned first this quality to the Envoy by way of conferring a benefit (*imtinân*), He would have ordered him with prayer

without any revelation from the *ḥaqq* and without witnessing God there, but ordered him the prayer so that vision and witnessing should result, which means that the *ḥaqq* mentioned through the way of conferring a benefit from His own *nafs* the light of his eyes in the prayer so that in the prayer He would be seen and witnessed. Revelation is the Divine conferring of benefit. The servant has no part in this except that he makes the effort and works at the accomplishment of an inclination in himself so that a revelation is manifested in him and he has vision. But if the revelation happened from the *ḥaqq* by way of conferring of benefit, then equally the witnessing by the Envoy happened through the way of conferring of benefit from the *ḥaqq*. That is why he said: 'The light of my eyes (*qurrah-al-ʿayn*) was brought to me . . .' and did not say: 'I did it.' Also he did not say that the *ḥaqq* did it through the way of answering, but rather he meant the condition which would point to the fact that it was brought to him through the way of conferring of benefit.

Yet it is so that the Envoy's light of the eyes is nothing other than witnessing the beloved *ḥaqq*, and it is through that witnessing that the lover's eye is lit. The words 'light of the eye' (*qurrah-al-ʿayn*) is derived from the word '*istiqrâr*' which means 'to dwell', which means that the eye of the Envoy, which is the lover, dwells at the level of seeing the *ḥaqq* who is the Beloved. At the level of his looking at the *ḥaqq*, and when the *ḥaqq* is what is looked at, he cannot look at anything else that is existent where *mashî'a* has to do with its existence, which means that his eye dwells on the *ḥaqq* through seeing It and by witnessing It; hence in the state of looking at the *ḥaqq* with the eye of the *ḥaqq*, he will not look at anything other in the images of knowledge and Divine relationships, things which are above the Divine *mashî'a* which are existent together with the Divine *mashî'a*, but dwells and is established with the witnessing of the *ḥaqq*, and his eye dwells there and he does not give recognition to anything else.

The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, said that the *qurrah-al-ʿayn* is from the word '*istiqrâr*', that is, from 'dwelling, remaining, resting', because anyone who witnesses his beloved, his eye remains, dwells, rests there. That is to say, it becomes established there and will not give recognition to, or acknowledge, any other thing, and he will not look at anything other in 'thing' or at any other thing. That is why the dwelling (resting) of the eye is used in the

meaning of 'gladdened', because the gladdening of anyone is brought about by his reaching what he desires, and it does not incline to the vision of another thing other than what he desires.

It is surprising that David of Caesarea, after having said the words 'in a thing' appertain to seeing, that it should not be conjectured that it could appertain to the words 'does not look', and then to say that it is also possible that it could appertain to the words 'does not look'.

Prayer being plea and witnessing, or because in the prayer the witnessing of the Beloved and the dwelling of the eye of the lover with the *ḥaqq*, and in reality because the *ḥaqq* is his direction of worship, God has forbidden to look or to acknowledge any other direction other than the direction (*qiblah*) of the prayer, because during the *ṣalât*, acknowledging another direction other than the direction of the direction of the prayer is a thing that the Devil seeks an occasion from the *ṣalât* of the servant. Thus, acknowledging any other direction prevents the servant from the witnessing of the *ḥaqq* which is the real Beloved, or in other words, because of that acknowledgement, the Devil prevents the servant from witnessing his Beloved. Rather, if the *ḥaqq* was the Beloved of this person who recognizes other things in his prayer and looks at other things than the direction of the prayer which is his Beloved, his heart and face would not acknowledge any other thing than the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, the servant who is in prayer faces the direction of the Beauty (*jamâl*) with the face of his heart to acknowledge the speech of the *ḥaqq* which comes about with the hearing with the heart, and if his eye was dwelling with the witnessing of the *jamâl* of the *ḥaqq*, if he does acknowledge anything else, that acknowledgement prevents him from witnessing the *ḥaqq*, because otherwise he would have been witnessing the *ḥaqq* with the facing of the heart, and if the facing of the heart acknowledges any other thing and turns that way, he would be deviating from the *ḥaqq*. Perhaps if one looks at it in reality one can see that if in the prayer the servant who is turned towards the *ḥaqq* and the *ḥaqq* was his real Beloved, and if he had considered Him as his highest desire and real purpose, he would not have acknowledged another thing with the facing of his heart if his direction of prayer was turned to the *ḥaqq*, because when the heart is turned to something which is its Beloved and considers that his direction, he cannot acknowledge any other thing, because the real dominion over his heart would dominate and would predicate over

him. However, a man knows his state in his *nafs* and he knows whether in this special devotion he has established his vision of the *ḥaqq* or not. That is to say, if he remains with the vision of the *ḥaqq* with the *shuhūd* of the *ḥaqq* in his prayer or not, he will know, because man has complete sight over his *nafs*. And if a person finds excuses for his *nafs* because of the outward appearances, he still knows that he is rationalizing his *nafs* and is not telling the truth about it, because no thing is ignorant of his own *nafs* because one's own state is a matter of pleasure to one's own self, and knows all the vicissitudes concerning the states of his *nafs*, even when he finds rationalizing excuses against what he has in his *nafs*, and he knows the truth about what he is pretending. Finally, if in this private devotion he knows that he is not established in the presence of God in that private prayer with vision, let him pay attention to this matter and try and work on it.

And for the one who is named in the prayer there is established a latter part, because in the prayer there is the first part and the latter part, and of these the one part is from us to the *ḥaqq*, and the other from the *ḥaqq* to us. Therefore, as the *ḥaqq* is the one prayed to, He is in the position of the named, therefore in the latter part. Consequently, He is revealed to us according to the images of our aptitude. So in His being revealed, He is there revealed to us with the Name of Lattness, second. Therefore, in the prayer the *ḥaqq* is latter in consequence of the servant in prayer, and it is that *ḥaqq* that the servant sees in his direction, and either sees Him with his mind or imagines Him as he can. And the *ḥaqq* which is latter in position to the being of the servant is the *ḥaqq* which is the Divinity believed in, which the one who believes has imagined. Therefore, the imagined God is latter to the one who imagines it because he brings it about.

And the believed-in God is of different varieties according to the aptitude of the place wherein It is present. That is to say, by virtue of the believer's aptitude which is the place, the *ḥaqq* becomes in many different ways, since the appearance and the revelation of the *ḥaqq* is by virtue of the particularity of the ability of the place wherein the revelation takes place. That is why Junayd, may God's mercy be on him, when asked about knowledge of God, the gnostic answered: 'The colour of the water is the colour of the container.' And this answer, it is according to the order of the things as they are, that is to say, the water has no colour and becomes coloured by the container.

In the same way, there is no definite image for the Absolute *haqq* so that the gnostic knows Him according to that image, since the *haqq* manifests from every place of manifestation by virtue of that place of manifestation, and from the belief of the people of beliefs He is manifest by virtue of the image of his belief. The *haqq* by Its Ipseity is beyond all qualification or attribution, therefore necessitates His manifestation with any qualification of every qualifier, every attributer, every knower; by virtue of what is necessitated it receives necessarily that by virtue of the qualifier, the attributer and the knower. And if the man of belief has partial belief, by virtue of his belief He manifests to him accordingly, but that total gnostic who does not have any body by virtue of his not having a limited belief, since he is in the knowledge of God, knows of Absoluteness, and as he is not conditioned in his belief by a particular belief in his knowledge and his witnessing, and that his gnosis and witnessing is absolute and does not see one thing or one quality except the *haqq*, and that he sees for the *haqq* only one reality and one face, but the *haqq* has manifested to him with one face and one reality in a thing, and therefore sees only the Absolute face of God by virtue of the *haqq*'s Absoluteness. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, says of that, this gnostic's colour does not exist. In his place of manifestation the revelation of the *haqq* manifests with singularity of quality, and he witnesses the *haqq* as revealed and manifest by virtue of the beliefs in the images of all beliefs, and in all places of manifestation by virtue of manifestation, and observes Him in His Ipseity, transcendent from all qualification and attribution. Thus the *haqq* that we imagine in our direction by virtue of our belief is the *haqq* who prays over us and is subject to our being. If we were the thing prayed to, the Latter Name would result for us and we would be realized in the place of that Name, and that Name would become established for us, just as when we mentioned it for the level of the state of the imagined God of our belief, this Name of Lateness became established there by virtue of the fact that it is latter through imagination and belief in the being of the servant. Therefore, we become apparent at its level in its mirror and its being by virtue of our condition. Consequently, the *haqq* does not look at us or reveal Himself to us except by the image of that thing we took to Him from our state and our inclination. That is to say, whatever image we bestow on Him due to our aptitude and we are manifest in the mirror of that being,

the *ḥaqq* manifests Himself to us and looks at us exactly in that image. For example, it is exactly like a person who looks at a mirror and reveals himself in the mirror; whichever form he is in, the mirror reveals back to him and manifests the image back to him exactly in that way. Consequently, our being is latter than the Being of the *ḥaqq* and consequently we are prayed upon and subject to Him, because in fact the word '*muṣalli*' in the dictionary is '*ḥalbah*', which means that on the racecourse it is the horse which comes after the horse which wins. Each thing knows the private *tasbîḥ* of his Lord which his private inclination has bestowed on him. That *tasbîḥ*, by virtue of the inclination of each of the *a'yân*, is his transcending Him which is his inclination for his Lord considering the shortcomings of the immanence. In fact there is not one thing of the *a'yân* who without exception is not in prostration and rendering grace to his Lord who is *ghafûr* and *ḥalîm*. In other words, he gives grace and gratitude to the *ḥaqq* with that totality of establishment, which completions (totalities) he accepted from his Lord, the *ḥalîm*, by virtue of his inclination, and transcends Him from the shortcomings that are necessitated by his '*ayn* of possibilities. Therefore he does the *tasbîḥ* with the rendering of grace and gratitude to his Lord the *ḥalîm*, because He does not precipitate with urgency the shortcomings of his possibilities, and the Lord does the *tasbîḥ* with rendering of grace and gratitude of being *ghafûr*, because He covers up his shortcomings and the dark-nesses of possibilities, in other words, immanential possibilities.

As there is resultant for each thing a private *tasbîḥ*, we do not understand each and every one of the *tasbîḥs* of the totality of the parts of the totality of the universe, because each thing does his *tasbîḥ* with the *tasbîḥ* particular to its own *nafs*. By the necessity of the words: 'They do the *tasbîḥ* with grace and gratitude of their Lord the *ḥalîm*', is because of the *âyat* (*sûrat*) which says: 'There is not one thing who does not do the *tasbîḥ* through the *tasbîḥ* of its own rendering of grace and gratitude.' In this *âyat* there is a degree, which means that thing which does the *tasbîḥ* with its own *ḥamd* which is rendering of grace and gratitude, means that that thing does that praise with that kind of praising upon which is established that thing. Now let it be known like this, that the *huwiyyah* of Oneness is particularized and manifest in the degree of Divinity, and consequently, as It is prayed to and the thing praised for the total It is equally manifest and particularized in each degree of the degrees of

immanence. Therefore everything renders grace and gratitude to the Absolute Lord. Equally, as the Absolute Being is relative in each degree of the things, that thing renders grace to the degree of Divinity through that degree of relativity, and equally each thing is thereupon established with his own praise and rendering of grace and gratitude and gives praise and gratitude according to the face that he gives grace and gratitude to himself. And equally also, everything is the manifestation of the private Name and that Name is his private Lord where in the place of manifestation of which he is manifest, hence his praise of himself again becomes the praise of his private Lord which is his Name. And again, everything gives praise and gratitude to what is brought about within his belief as his believed-in Divinity, and that believed-in Divinity is brought about by him and is his own make, and the making of a thing refers back to his own *nafs*. Consequently, the rendering of praise to the believed-in Divinity of each thing becomes again praising and giving thanks and gratitude to his own self. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, when he said each thing's rendering of grace and praise is particular to his own *nafs*, meant it this way, as (since) he has explained this, and do not be caught up in heedlessness (neglect). Nevertheless, we have mentioned concerning the believer that in reality a believer does not praise except that Divinity which is manifest and particularized in his belief, and to which the believer has attached his own *nafs*. Everything that results from the work of the believer refers back to himself. Consequently, the believer did not praise anything except his *nafs*. In fact, it is such that if somebody praises a work, without a doubt he is praising the maker of that work, because in fact the beauty or lack of beauty of that piece of work refers to its maker. But the fact is, the Divinity of the believer is a thing made for the person who is looking at it which he has brought about in his own mind, and he turns towards it and looks at that. Consequently, the Divinity of the believer is the art of the believer, and it results that the praise of the believer in such a believer is the praise of himself because it is of his own making, and the making of a thing refers to himself. And it is because of this that as the believer praises his own believed-in Divinity results in him praising his own *nafs*, is why a believer dispraises the belief of another, because that belief is not of his making. If such a believer was tolerant, dispraise would not have happened. In other words, of the people of partial beliefs, each believer praises

and lauds his own believed-in Divinity which is the product of his imagination and what he has created in his own mind, and maligns and dispraises the belief of another. But if the believer were tolerant, that is to say, if he were knowledgeable according to reality, he would know that the colour of water is the colour of what contains it, that is, if he knew that all the images is the result of all the believers, and that God reveals Himself to them according to the beliefs of the believers, he would not have dispraised the belief of another. Rather, he would be like the gnostic who is complete of gnosis, and would know the *ḥaqq* manifest in all the images of beliefs and observe Him there. The believer's praise of the Divinity which is according to his belief is his praise to his own self, and this is definitely so, that this person who has a private belief is without a doubt ignorant of another's belief because of the fact that he considered the belief of the other as being belief in another thing. In short, he is ignorant because he does not know God in the images of another's belief. Had he known that the colour of the water is the colour of the glass as in Junayd's words, that is to say, that the *ḥaqq* appears to each believer according to the belief of that man, he would have admitted that each person believes in the *ḥaqq*, and he would have known God in each belief and in each image. Hence, the possessor of a private belief is possessor of a supposition (assumption, view), which means that he is the possessor of a supposition but is not a knower. That is why God said: 'I am according to what My servant supposes I am like', which means that I am existent with My servant at the level of his supposition. In other words, I manifest to him in the image of his belief. If what he believes in is absolute or if what he believes in is relative; that is to say, if what he believes in is absolute, that is to say he believes in all images of belief and does not retain a private belief, then I reveal Myself to him in absoluteness, but if he relativizes through a private belief I reveal Myself to him in the image of his relative belief, through his private belief. The Divinity of beliefs, that is to say, the Divinity limited by the revelation in the images of a belief, for each of the people who have these beliefs and who believe only in that image of the *ḥaqq* in which they believe and which they imagine, and by which imagination and belief they limit the *ḥaqq* into that image, they differentiate the subject of this belief from any other images. Consequently, the Divinity which is in the belief of each believer is a limited Divinity, and in the images of belief the

Divinity is such a Divinity to which the heart of Its servant has enlarged itself for It, whether the believer is in the belief of an absolute or the belief of a relative. In fact the Absolute Divinity, considering that It is the same as the things, nothing becomes enlarged for It, because It is the same as that thing and It is the same as Its own *nafs*; and yet one cannot say that something became enlarged for its own self and you cannot even say it does not become enlarged for its own self, because by virtue of knowledge the High *ḥaqq* is large for all things and is the same as the existence of the things, therefore It is large enough for Its own Self, and God says: 'My Lord has enlarged everything knowledge-wise.' And the angels said: 'Our Lord has enlarged everything *rahmah*-wise and knowledge-wise', and there is no doubt that God knows His own Essence. Consequently, knowledge-wise He knows His Self and is large enough for it.

Now let it be known like this, that the *ḥaqq*, according to His words: 'I am according to the supposition of My servant', reveals Himself to each believing servant according to this belief, because the *ḥaqq* by the Absoluteness of Its Singularity encompasses everything, and consequently encompasses the totality of the images of the senses, imagination, conjecture, intellect, supposition and knowledge, because the *ḥaqq* is both *ẓāhir* and *bāṭin*, and all of these images are not outside the *ẓāhir* and the *bāṭin*. Consequently, whichever way the supposition of the servant happens to be, the Divinity he believes in, whether it be immanential (*tashbīh*), sensory, or imaginary or conjectural, or whether it be transcendent, intellectual, God manifests Himself and becomes revealed to the believer according to the image of his belief, which means that God is not manifest to that person except according to the image that man has of It, whether it be according to absoluteness or relativity. The absolutization of the *ḥaqq* is of the honour of the intellect and is not of the honour of comprehension (perception) (*idrāk*) which is below the intellect.

Intellect is relative, hence the believer takes as limit his Divinity, but some of the limits are different from other limits. Consequently, to the Divinity of a belief is enlarged the heart of the servant who believes in Him without knowing Him because belief happens in the heart, but the Absolute Divinity which is the same as everything, nothing is enlarged for It except the heart of the '*ʿarīf*' which is total essence, because the heart of the '*ʿarīf*' changes (is twiddled) with the

ḥaqq, whether it be in absoluteness or relativity, because it is devoid of any particularization (*ta'ayyun*) and without any qualification, because it is by its own essence *fanî* in the *ḥaqq* and *bâqî* in the *ḥaqq*. The heart of the *'ârîf* is the Heart of the *ḥaqq* which has been particularized by the First *ta'ayyun*, and in that *ta'ayyun* all particularizations are in annihilation and He is in the individuations of the complete people. And you, understand this mystery with the understanding of the Divinity which is bestowed upon the origin, because the word of the *ḥaqq* is truthful (*şâdiq*) and is according to what is. God leads whom He wants to the straight path.

The *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* is the major work of Muḥyiddin Ibn 'Arabi, known as the 'Greatest Shaykh'. Its theme is the Infinite Wisdom which is at once unique in Itself and many-faceted in its representation in the line of prophets from Adam to Mohammed. It is simultaneously an explanation of the profoundest meaning of man's existence and perfectability, and an esoteric exegesis of the Quran. In treating of the Divine Wisdom, it is so faithful to its subject that the book is itself a paradigm of its theme.

Muḥyiddin Ibn 'Arabi was born in Andalusia, Spain, in AD 1165. From the age of thirty-two he travelled extensively throughout the Islamic world, conversing with the greatest mystics, divines and philosophers of his day. He wrote some five hundred books, of which he considered that *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* to be the most important. Although as an outspoken critic of religious and philosophical dogmatism he made many enemies, he was and is revered as a saint and as a teacher of incomparable stature. His last major opus, the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, should be read with a pre-understanding of the point of view and reference and the ensuing perspective, for which Ibn 'Arabi is unmatched. It is to Ibn 'Arabi, who speaks from objective vision of the Unique Existence, that the exposition of Its Self-revelation may be ascribed, as the first Sufi to correlate the 'theory' of *wahdat-i-wujūd*, of which he is celebrated as the originator and most complete propounder of all time. He died in Damascus in AD 1240.

Ismail Hakki (AD 1653-1725), known as the 'Bursevi' from his long association with Bursa in Turkey, was originally from Aydos, near Adrianople. He studied with Osman Fazli, the shaykh of the Sufi Order of the Velvetis, and eventually became his successor. His knowledge of both Arabic and Turkish was superlative. His extensive commentary upon the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, published here in full, is surely the best of the many commentaries which this book has inspired, being aligned perfectly and completely to the spirit of the original, whilst his Introduction which forms an integral part of this volume is without doubt a masterpiece in itself.